

The Library

Fourth Series
Vol. IX. No. 3.

December 1928

SOME ASPECTS OF SHERIDAN BIBLIOGRAPHY

By R. CROMPTON RHODES¹



SINCE September 1925, when I contributed two articles on the early editions of Sheridan to *The Times Literary Supplement*, I have been engaged continuously in studying his bibliography, the results of which are to be seen in my edition of *The Plays and Poems of Richard Brinsley Sheridan*.² Although the bibliographies in that edition record double the number of early editions known to Mr. Walter Sichel in his *Sheridan*, 1909, I do not even now consider that they are exhaustive, for since January 1st of this year, when my edition went to press, I have discovered three editions of no great importance not recorded. However, in the present paper my aim has rather been to show that, complicated though the bibliography of Sheridan may seem, it is by no means unique, since other dramatists of the time like Macklin and O'Keeffe suffered as he did at the hands of pirates. This is, I believe, the first connected attempt to discuss, even in outline, the general question of dramatic piracy in the Sheridan period, and it enables me to present certain facts as to the financial side of dramatic authorship which have a direct bearing on the working of the laws of copyright.

'Sheridan's Fight with the Pirates' would have been an

¹ Read before the Bibliographical Society, 15 October 1928.

² Oxford, 1928, 3 vols.; cited as *Plays and Poems*.

admirable title for this paper, for it would at once have acknowledged my obligation to the example of Dr. Pollard, as the founder of the new science of dramatic bibliography, and strike at once at the heart of the matter. For Richard Brinsley Sheridan, like William Shakespeare, suffered much at the hands of dramatic pirates: according to Mr. Walter Sichel, 'he expressly told his second wife that he sanctioned no versions of his works, except *The Critic*, *Pizarro*, and his pamphlets on the East India Bills'.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Sichel did not quote the exact words, and their context, for they convey the impression that none of the other six plays of Sheridan was printed with his sanction. But Sheridan wrote a preface to the First Edition of *The Rivals* (1775), and there can be no reasonable doubt that he sanctioned the Third Edition Corrected of the same play (1776). Both these plays were printed by John Wilkie, whose house held the copyrights in 1821 when the authorized Collected Edition was published. The same house published *A Trip to Scarborough* (1781). Moreover, *The Duenna* (1794) was printed by the equally reputable house of Longman, from a copy supplied, according to Boaden, by Thomas Harris, the owner of the copyright. In these five cases there was no piracy. Until the Collected Edition of 1821, which had the authority of Sheridan's executors, *St. Patrick's Day* had never been printed in London, but an edition of *The Camp* in 1795, and three editions of *The School for Scandal*, in 1786, in 1788, and in 1798, had appeared with London imprints. Again, *The Dramatic Works of R. B. Sheridan, Esq.*, had been published about 1797 by A. Millar, W. Law, and R. Cater. This edition included *The School for Scandal* and a spurious text of *The Duenna*, which had previously appeared with a London imprint in 1783. But Millar's *Dramatic Works*, the three separate issues of *The School for Scandal*, the one issue of *The Camp*, and the one issue of *The Duenna*, exhaust the piracies of Sheridan's

plays bearing London imprints, and I suspect that at least two of these editions were printed in Dublin. But so confusing is the bibliography of Sheridan that Mr. Fraser Rae considered that not even *The Critic* was the author's text, although it was issued with a dedication by Sheridan; and he considered that *The Rivals* (he seems to have in mind the edition of 1791) was abridged and altered by Wilkie, yet it reprinted the Third Edition Corrected of 1776, which was followed by all future London editions, and represents, in my opinion, the standard revised text of the comedy as it was acted at Drury Lane, after Sheridan had rewritten it. It may be remembered that on the first night *The Rivals* was nearly damned, and then withdrawn and revised by the author, who acknowledged that the censures of the audience were justified in his preface to the hastily prepared First Edition. A transcript of the original version, by the way, about half as long again as the accepted text of the First or Third Editions, has recently been discovered; and Dr. Richard Purdy, of Yale University, is engaged upon an edition of which this, I believe, is the first public intimation.

Although the violations of copyright by London printers were thus few, it seems clear that numerous editions printed in Dublin were sold surreptitiously in England, especially of *The School for Scandal*. Sheridan retained the copyright of this comedy until about 1794, when he sold it to James Ridgway, the publisher of *Pizarro*. But he never gave him a copy of the play even then, though Ridgway, as holder of these two copyrights, had a share in the Collected Edition, 1821, which was published by John Murray. Another holder of the copyrights was Wilkie, who then received £300 for his share, but 'nothing more is specified as to what that share included'.¹

It is important, however, that one should not dwell exclusively upon piratical publishers and printers, for as Shylock said, 'there be land rats and water rats, land thieves and water

¹ This information from Col. John Murray 1926. Cf. *Plays and Poems*, i. xvi.

thieves'—that is to say, besides piratical printers and publishers there were piratical players who used every means in their power to obtain or concoct copies of the plays of the moment. A dramatic author has two chief rights to his works: (i) stage-right, or the right to sanction or refuse performance, and (ii) copyright, the right to sanction or refuse publication. In Sheridan's time, these two rights were established and recognized in the English courts of law, but not in their present form or force. There were two important differences which affected not only Sheridan but all other dramatic authors: the first difference was that stage-right covered only manuscript plays, and ceased at once on printing; the second difference was that English copyright did not extend to Ireland—an Irish printer could, and did, reprint any book, or print any manuscript, with impunity.

The right of the Irish printer to any English copy he could get seems to have been taken for granted. At all events, Swift in 1728 wrote to Gay about *The Beggar's Opera*: 'I bought your opera to-day for sixpence, but so small printed that it will spoil my eyes' (26 February). 'I wish you had sent me a copy, as I desired, to oblige an honest bookseller. It would have done Motte no hurt, for no English copy has been sold, but the Dublin one has sold prodigiously' (28 March).¹ Motte appears to have been the Dublin agent for Watts, the English publisher, and his copies would cost three times the Irish issues, since London printers issued their plays at eighteen pence. The Dublin printers sold theirs at 'a British sixpence', commonly called 'half a thirteener', that is, 6½d. Hibernian currency, there being thirteen pence to an Irish shilling.

So far as plays are concerned, the usual source of supply of the Irish printer seems to have been the dishonest prompter of English provincial theatres, who made surreptitious copies of his prompt-books, themselves often surreptitiously obtained

¹ W. E. Schultz, *The Beggar's Opera*, 1923.

from the London theatres. There is no doubt, however, that the owner of the English copyright could, by legal process, both prevent the sale of such piratical editions in England and obtain redress for violations of copyright. Whether Sheridan actually took any formal legal proceedings has yet to be ascertained: it seems to me very likely that he suppressed Cadell's London edition of *The School for Scandal* in 1786; while from 1799 to 1804, and for many years after, Ridgway, as owner of the copyright, printed on the plays that he sold notices of his intention to prosecute the vendors of spurious copies of *The School for Scandal*.

Since editing *An Ode to the Genius of Scandal* (Oxford, 1927), generally attributed to Sheridan, I have recently discovered that Kearsley's edition of 1781 was suppressed by the author by an injunction; but a search of the printed legal records does not show any trace of this case. However, it is certain that George Colman, the owner of the copyright of Foote's unpublished plays, succeeded in suppressing the unauthorized publications of *The Cozeners* and *The Maid of Bath*—whose heroine was, of course, Mrs. Richard Brinsley Sheridan, formerly Elizabeth Linley. Again there appears to be no reference in the law books, but the record must still be extant in the Court of Chancery. On the appearance of the piracies (Wheble, 1778) Colman promptly issued *The Cozeners* (published by Cadell, 1778) and prefaced to it this Advertisement:

'Some copies of spurious impressions of this comedy, and of *The Maid of Bath* having been printed and circulated before the application to the Court of Chancery for an Injunction, it has been thought advisable immediately to commit to the press genuine editions of the two dramattick pieces above-mentioned together with the Comedy of *The Devil upon Two Sticks*.'

¹ These three plays and *The Taylors*, all by the late Sam. Foote, Esq., as published by Mr. Colman, were reviewed in *The London Magazine* for (the end

This establishes that the law of copyright could be enforced as to plays, and it leads to the alternative conclusions that Sheridan connived at, or suppressed, the unauthorized English editions of his plays—‘a very cautious conjecture that’, as Mr. Sneer said in *The Critic*.

Stage-right, it must be repeated, ceased as soon as a play was printed. Accordingly, managers jealously guarded the prompt-books, and were accustomed to make the purchase of the copyright a part of their original bargain with the author. Between 1779 and 1789, Colman of the Haymarket purchased the copyright of five of O’Keeffe’s plays; and his son, the younger Colman, refused to allow them to be printed in the Collected Edition of some twenty years later; and for fifty years after their original performances no authorized issues were published. Yet all of them had been printed in corrupt and spurious texts—‘full of the most glaring errors’, said O’Keeffe, ‘and containing expressions and passages that never came from my pen’. The most popular of them, *The Agreeable Surprise*, was pirated at Newry in 1783—my unrecorded copy of this edition seems to be unique—and one cannot be certain that the correct text is to be found, even in George Daniel’s edition of 1832 in *Cumberland’s British Theatre*. It happens that *The Agreeable Surprise* was the subject of an important test-case in 1795, which established that the stage-right of unpublished plays did not extend beyond the Cities of London and Westminster. These are the testimonies:

‘When the younger Colman succeeded to the Haymarket ‘in 1795, he instituted a legal process against our manager ‘[Captain Wathen of Richmond Theatre] for pirating, as he ‘thought, the farce of *The Agreeable Surprise*. The verdict ‘of a jury has, however, established that no copyright bears

of) March 1778. This indicates the date of the action. Mr. G. H. Wilcox, LL.B., has searched the law-books for records of these cases, but in his opinion they must be looked for in the High Courts.

'sufficient authority to prevent a representation out of the metropolis.'—James Winston, *The Theatric Tourist*, 1803.

'I was at Esher when Captain Wathen was playing my *Agreeable Surprise* and *Son in Law* at his Theatre at Richmond; and the younger Mr. Colman to prevent him, brought a cause into the Court of King's Bench. Mr. Erskine was counsel for Colman, Mr. Law for Wathen: Lord Kenyon was on the Bench.'—John O'Keeffe, *Recollections*, 1826.¹

Hitherto it had been generally assumed that the managers who held the London rights could also prevent performances in the provincial theatres, whether they could or could not do so in the Irish theatres. This brings me at once to *The Duenna*. Harris, of Covent Garden, refused to allow it to be copied by the provincial managers, among them Tate Wilkinson of the Theatre Royal, York. But, according to custom, there were two minor rights not always included in the sale of the copyright—the author retained the profits on the books of songs sold in the theatre,² and the composer retained the sale of the

¹ Macklin's *Love a-la-Mode*, first acted in 1759, was not issued till a subscription edition was printed in quarto. J. Bell, London, 1793. Allardyce Nicoll records earlier editions: 1784, 12mo; 1785, 16mo; 1786, 12mo. It would be interesting to know, in view of this passage from O'Keefe's *Recollections*, if Macklin had them suppressed:

'A country manager, many years ago, took upon himself to bring out Macklin's *Love a-la-mode*, at his theatre; upon which Macklin wrote him word that if he attempted to do so, he would send him sheets of parchment that would reach from Chancery-lane to the next gooseberry-bush, the nearest verge of Yorkshire to John O'Groat's house. The manager's answer to Macklin ran thus—"Your *Love a-la-mode*, Sir! I'm not going to play your *Love a-la-mode*; I'll play my own *Love a-la-mode*: I have twenty *Love a-la-modes*. I could write a *Love a-la-mode* every day in the week, I could write three hundred and sixty-six *Love a-la-modes* in a year."

'The reason of Macklin's tenacity with respect to his play was, his never having sold the copyright to any one, and he never had it printed: therefore, whenever it was acted in England, Scotland, and Ireland, his terms were, half the profits over the nightly charges, and he always played in it himself.'

² They were carried round by the fruit women, and also sold by the box-keepers.

printed music, usually the Overture, the airs, and (though not always) the accompanying words. It cannot be sure that Sheridan had the sale of the books of words—'Songs, Duets, Trios etc. in the *Duenna*: or, the Double Elopement. Price Sixpence'—which ran into some twenty-five editions before 1778; nor whether he had the profit on the music, which he saw through the press, 'For the Voice, Harpsichord or Violin, Thompson [n.d.]'.

Now, as soon as copies of the words and music were to be bought, if a complete performance could not be given there was nothing to prevent a provincial manager giving as part of an entertainment a presentation of the songs in costume. And this is precisely what happened at Birmingham on 12 August 1776 at the theatre in King Street. But Tate Wilkinson of York had gone one better. He produced on Easter Monday 1776, as he said in *The Wandering Patentee*, 1795, what is called to this day Wilkinson's *Duenna*. This is explained in his *Memoirs* (ii. 230):

'The fashion of not publishing is quite modern, and the favourite pieces not being printed, but kept under lock and key, is of infinite prejudice to us poor devils in the country theatres, as we really cannot afford to pay for the purchase of MSS.—The only time I ever exercised my pen on such an occasion was on a trial of necessity. Mr. Harris bought that excellent comic opera of *The Duenna* from Mr. Sheridan. I saw it several times, and finding it impossible to move Mr. Harris's tenderness, I locked myself up in my room, set down first the jokes I remembered, then I laid a book of the songs before me, and with magazines kept the regulation of the scenes, and by the help of a numerous collection of obsolete Spanish plays I produced an excellent opera; I may say excellent—and an unprecedented compilement; for whenever Mr. Younger, or any other country manager wanted a copy of *The Duenna*, Mr. Harris told them they

'might play Mr. Wilkinson's: hundreds have seen it in every town in Great Britain and Ireland. Mrs. Webb has acted the part of the Duenna in my Opera, as I call it, many nights at Edinburgh, Mr. Suett, the Jew, at York, etc.'

It happens that in Dublin there began in 1777 a 'spirited contest' between the two rival theatres in Fishamble Street and Crow Street. The rival managers both played versions of *The Duenna*, the latter house, however, under the management of Ryder, giving it on 31 January 1777 under the title of *The Governess*. This version, which was afterwards printed (Dublin, 1777, 12mo), corresponds exactly with what Tate Wilkinson's concoction must have been—the songs are correct, the plot is followed, but the dialogue is different. Moreover, the names of the characters are altered. Now it needs special qualifications and special opportunities to pirate a play, and it seems to me likely that what Ryder produced was in fact Wilkinson's *Duenna*, whose concocter expressly mentions it as having been acted in Ireland. In 1793, sixteen years later, *The Governess* was reprinted by Jones of Dublin for the first time with Sheridan's name as author, and in this form it appeared in the first collected edition of Sheridan's works, issued in 1795 by Jones, who published similar piratical collected editions of Macklin and Burgoyne, of which more will be said later. About 1797 the same version appeared in the first undated London collected edition—Millar's—with the exception that Sheridan's title of *The Duenna* is used, and the original names of the characters are restored. The genuine text was not printed until 1794, by Longman of Paternoster Row.

But we have not done with *The Duenna*. On 21 February 1777, three weeks after *The Governess*, *The Duenna* was produced at Fishamble Street, and the proprietors of Covent Garden, on 17 April, applied in the Irish courts for an injunction to restrain the managers from performing *The Duenna*; but, as Mr. W. J. Lawrence tells me, on 23 April the Lord

Chancellor refused the injunction, the Court sustaining the plea of the defendants, viz. 'that any one could repeat what had been made public'.

Apparently, then, this judgement anticipated, so far as Ireland is concerned, the verdict of the English High Court in *Colman v. Watzen* of 1795. But on the other hand there is the possibility that the managers of Fishamble Street, like Ryder, had obtained 'Wilkinson's *Duenna*', in which case, stage-right having ceased in the songs, the rest of the play was not Sheridan's but Wilkinson's, there being then, I believe, no copyright in plot. In any case, it is certain that, whether their right to pirate was or was not established, at the end of the same year, 1777, occurs the first recorded instance of an Irish manager paying a fee to an English author: this is the £100 which Ryder paid to Sheridan, or rather his sister, for a copy of *The School for Scandal*. Ryder's successor, Daly, continued the practice: he bought *The Castle of Andalusia* from O'Keeffe for £100 and gave him £50 each for several other plays.¹ He also bought *The Belle's Stratagem* from Mrs. Cowley.

Apparently authors made no profits from English provincial performances. O'Keeffe wrote:

'During the whole of my dramatic career, I never received 'a shilling from any theatre in the world, except Covent 'Garden, the Haymarket, the Dublin theatre (under Daly), 'and my one night in Drury Lane [in 1798], the latter being 'the profits of my condemned play—*She's Eloped*.'

This still held even on the rare occasions when provincial companies performed plays not previously acted in London. O'Keeffe wanted Tate Wilkinson to buy a copy of his *Doldrum* in 1796, but the York magnate politely refused. Though Reynolds's *Werner* was acted successfully in 1785, at Bath, and by the Bath company at Bristol, the author received not a penny for

¹ For the references to O'Keeffe, see his *Recollections* (1826).

it.¹ In the next year the same dramatist received only £8 for the third night of his *Eloisa*, at Covent Garden.

However, Sheridan did obtain one consideration for his permission for *The School for Scandal* to be acted at Bath, which was the release of Henderson the actor, whom he wanted at Drury Lane.

Again, it does not appear that after 1777 stage-right ceased legally in Ireland, even if English managers failed to get it enforced. It seems that Colman applied for injunctions against other Irish managers, for in his prologue to *Tit for Tat*, acted at Haymarket in 1786, he wrote :

Long hath old England giv'n, as from the helm,
Dramatic laws to ev'ry sister realm.
Scotland her Theatres delights to rear,
But for Supplies, for Ways and Means, looks here.
Hibernia, too, improves the friendly hint,
'A new play, honey, fait', there 's nothing in't,
For we have all their manuscripts in print.'
Teague speaks but truth. Across St. George's Channel,
John Bull in vain his juries would impanel;
In vain expects grave Chancellors to sit,
And guard by equity the Rights of Wit,
While distant Managers feel no compunctions,
And laugh alike at Actions and Injunctions.

Before leaving *The Duenna* I would like to call attention to one entry in John P. Anderson's *Sheridan Bibliography*, affixed to Lloyd Sanders's *Life of Sheridan* :

The Duenna. A Comic Opera. London 1775. 8vo.

Anderson omitted to show in the first place that his date was conjectural, for no such book was published in that year ; secondly, that what he was listing was the undated issue of a political parody, attributed to Israel Pottinger, or some pamphleteer, who ever afterwards described himself as ' the author of the

¹ *Life and Times*, i. 323.

Duenna'. He so described himself in an ode called *The General Fast* (which figures as Sheridan's in all the bibliographies) usually dated 1775, whereas it must be 1776, the year when the Fast was ordered and the poem reviewed. He so described himself in *The Critic* of 1780, another political parody, which title-page book-listing sometimes attributes to Sheridan and claims as the first edition of his comedy. Actually, in January 1775, before *The Rivals* was produced, Mary Linley wrote to her sister, Mrs. Sheridan, 'I am told he will get at least £700 for his play'.¹ Whoever told her that was taking an exaggerated view of the possibilities. In those times it was the custom for a dramatic author to receive payment by having a 'benefit' or 'author's night' every third night up till nine—the third, sixth, and ninth nights were therefore 'author's nights', when he was entitled to the gross takings of the house, less a fixed and invariable sum for 'charges' or expenses. At Drury Lane in 1772 and 1777 the charges were £73 10s. od. nightly. In 1772 Murphy, for *The Grecian Daughter*, received £179 1s. od. for the third night, £198 18s. od. for the sixth night, and £191 7s. 6d. for the ninth: a total of £569 6s. 6d.² After his third benefit night 'author's nights' ceased, and no part of the profits went to him, while the stage-right became the absolute property of the theatre, so long as the play was unprinted.

In 1773 Goldsmith wrote to his friend Joseph Cradock: 'I cannot help saying that I am very sick of the stage, and though I believe I shall get three tolerable benefits, yet I shall upon the whole be a loser, even in a pecuniary light.' For his three nights he received exactly £502 18s. 6d., as is testified by the Covent Garden ledger in the British Museum.³

Accordingly an author could expect for his five-act tragedy, comedy, or comic opera between £500 and £550 and no more, besides what he obtained for the copyright. O'Keeffe some-

¹ *Plays and Poems*, i. 128.

² Jesse Foot, *Life of Murphy*, 1811.

³ Quoted by Dr. K. C. Balderstone in *Goldsmith's Collected Letters*, 1928.

times sold his 'nights' together with the copyright to Harris of Covent Garden: for *The Banditti* in 1781 he received 600 guineas—a bad bargain for the manager, because the play failed on the first night; and for *Fontainebleau* in 1784 he received £600, but (both of these being comic operas) out of his gross receipts the author had to pay the composer fees amounting to £120. Accordingly, for the stage-right and copyright of *The Duenna* Sheridan must have received about £600, of which his father-in-law, the composer Thomas Linley, was entitled to £120, which sum of course may have gone to his daughter, Elizabeth Sheridan.

I have discovered no instance between *The Beggar's Opera* in 1728 and *The Dramatist* in 1789 where an author had more than three nights. Gay, in his own statement, 'gained between seven and eight hundred pounds' for *The Beggar's Opera*, which included the sale of the copyright. He had a fourth benefit—*ex gratia Richii*, I suppose—on the fifteenth night, and another, Pearce asserts, on the eighteenth.¹ I know of no other exception to the rule of three author's nights till 1789. At the third night of *The Dramatist*, by Frederick Reynolds, at Covent Garden, the receipts were £180, the charges of the house being £100; then Harris purchased the author's other two nights, together with his copyright, for £200, 'adding that if 'by any miracle the comedy should be performed for twenty 'nights, the author should have a further benefit on the twenty-'first'.² Thus originated the custom, which still existed in 1826, of the author having added to his three nights a fourth on the twenty-first performance.

Sheridan therefore had three nights and no more for *The School for Scandal*, and received somewhere about £520. At all events, the piece was acted twelve nights in its first season, the nine theatre's nights amounting to a total of £2,223 11s. od.,

¹ W. E. Schultz, *The Beggar's Opera*, 1923.

² Reynolds, *Life and Times*, 1826.

which is an average of £247 1s. 3d. The theatre accounts for the other three nights record only the 'charges' of £73 10s. od., but taking the average as being maintained, Sheridan's profits were £520 11s. 9d.—after which his interest as an author in the stage-right ceased.

But Sheridan was manager as well as author, and therefore he retained a certain financial interest in *The School for Scandal*; so 'for reasons of State', as his critics put it, he refused to print it, though often urged to do so. He continued his refusal even after he had sold the copyright to Ridgway, about 1794, for once printed it could have been acted at the rival theatres, Covent Garden and the Haymarket. Of course, there were understandings between the several managers, but theatres changed owners, and precaution was safer than remonstrance. It was not until the first decade of the nineteenth century that *The School for Scandal* entered the repertory of the other London theatres, and it was then thirty years old. Eventually, after Sheridan's death, for John Murray's *Collected Works of 1821*, a text of the comedy was obtained. But it was not a transcript of the prompt-book of Drury Lane, for that was used by John Cumberland for his edition of 1826, which was edited by George Daniel. This text differs in something like two hundred instances from the text of the collected edition. I think that the text of 1821, reprinted by John Murray in a separate edition of 1823—and since accepted as the standard version, as in the Oxford edition—was taken from a hasty and careless copy, made for either the Haymarket or Covent Garden. Yet until I challenged its accuracy, nobody suspected that there was the slightest doubt as to its absolute and verbal authenticity. It is true that Joseph Knight and other editors realized that 'the green suckers of youth' ought not to be spelt 'succours'; but there, and not unreasonably so, it ended. This statement needs some modification, for one person pointed out that the text of Murray's *Collected Edition* of

1821 differed from that of the manuscript which the author sent to his friend, Mrs. Crewe. That person was Thomas Moore, but the issue was obscured by the fact that Moore was supposed to have edited the Collected Edition, and appears in all the reference-books as its editor, yet he merely wrote a preface, and elsewhere expressly disclaimed all other responsibility. And one other writer did challenge every previous editor, and that was Fraser Rae, who in his *Sheridan's Plays as he Wrote Them* printed, from manuscripts in the possession of the Sheridans of Frampton Court, what he declared to be the original version, though it contains speeches that were never spoken by a character, Miss Verjuice, who was suppressed in revision before acting. It was, in fact, a late draft, and some scenes are missing; but any editor who used it intelligently could, if he had dared, have made many necessary corrections in the accepted text.

Moore, however, pointed out that the authentic text had once been printed in what he called 'the' Dublin edition, though he can hardly have failed to know that this vague description fitted not one but many. However, there is no doubt as to which edition he meant, for his own copy of it—'Taken from a Correct Copy: Dublin: Printed for the Booksellers,' 1799—is still in existence: it was one of the many books bequeathed by his widow to the Royal Irish Academy. It was through the kindness of Mr. W. J. Lawrence that I was enabled to find this copy at the Academy and collate it. Happily, Moore had amended the text, though not scrupulously, in accordance with the Crewe MSS. Without going into textual details, it is clear from the Rae draft of 1776-7 that both the Crewe MS. and the Dublin prompt-book accidentally omitted a few sentences, which were still preserved in Cumberland's edition of 1826. However, a general collation of the several editions has enabled me at last to furnish a text

¹ I am inclined to think this means 'for the Company of Booksellers'.

which recovers, within the limits of human fallibility, the text as it was spoken at Drury Lane on the first night. It agrees with Cumberland's edition of 1826 except for minor discrepancies and the omission of two short passages, then no longer intelligible, which means that the authentic text was used for forty years at Drury Lane. My text therefore disagrees with the former accepted text in at least two hundred words or phrases. In fact, I claim that, though in perhaps three instances my choice may reasonably be challenged, the old time-honoured readings of the accepted text must be finally rejected as incorrect.

There were numerous other editions besides the Dublin 1799, and all of them follow the same spurious text. Three passages taken quite at random will show the nature of the difference between the genuine and the spurious texts ;

Act I, Sc. i

GENUINE

Servant. Madam, Mrs. Candour is below, and if your ladyship's at leisure, will leave her carriage.

Lady Sneerwell. Beg her to walk in. (*Exit Servant.*) Now, Maria, here is a character to your taste ; for though Mrs. Candour is a little talkative, everybody allows her to be the best natured and best sort of woman.

SPURIOUS

Servant. Mrs. Candour, madam, if you are at leisure, will leave her carriage.

Lady Sneerwell. Desire her to walk up. (*Exit Servant.*) Now, Maria, here's a character to your taste ; though Mrs. Candour is a little talkative, yet every body allows she is the best natured sort of woman in the world.

Act II, Sc. i

Sir Peter Teazle. Old enough !—aye—there it is. Well, well, Lady Teazle, though my life may be made unhappy by your temper, I'll not be ruined by your extravagance.

Lady Teazle. My extravagance ? I'm sure I'm not more extravagant than a woman of fashion ought to be.

Sir Peter Teazle. Aye, there it is. Oons, madam, what right have you to run into all this extravagance ?

Lady Teazle. I'm sure I am not more extravagant than a woman of quality ought to be.

GENUINE

Sir Peter Teazle. No, no, madam, you shall throw away no more sums on such unmeaning luxury. 'Slife! to spend as much to furnish your dressing-room with flowers in winter as would suffice to turn the Pantheon into a greenhouse, and give a *fête champêtre* at Christmas.

SPURIOUS

Sir Peter Teazle. 'Slife, madam, I'll have no more sums squandered away upon such unmeaning luxuries; you have as many flowers in your dressing-room, as would turn the Pantheon into a green-house; or make a *Fête Champêtre* at a mas—

Act III, Sc. i

Sir Oliver Surface. Ah!—he is my brother's son.

Sir Peter Teazle. Well, but how is Sir Oliver personally to—

Rowley. Why, sir, I will inform Charles and his brother, that Stanley has obtained permission to apply in person to his friends, and as they have neither of them ever seen him, let Sir Oliver assume his character, and he will have a fair opportunity of judging at least, of the benevolence of their dispositions; and believe me, sir, you will find in the youngest brother one who, in the midst of folly and dissipation, has still, as our immortal bard expresses it,—*A tear for pity, and a hand, Open as day, for melting charity.*

Sir Peter Teazle. Pshaw! What signifies his having an open hand or purse either, when he has nothing left to give? Well, well—make the trial, if you please. But where is the fellow whom you brought for Sir Oliver to examine, relative to Charles's affairs?

Sir Oliver Surface. Aye—he's my brother's son.

Rowley. Now, sir, we propose, that Sir Oliver shall visit them both, in the character of Mr. Stanley; as I have informed them he has obtained leave of his creditors to wait on his friends in person—and in the younger, believe me, you'll find one, who, in the midst of dissipation and extravagance, has still, as our immortal bard expresses, *A tear of pity, and a hand open as day for melting charity.*

Sir Peter Teazle. What signifies his open hand and purse, if he has nothing to give? But where is this person you were speaking of?

These are typical instances, and though in some places the text is accurate, other authors suffered similarly. O'Keeffe speaks of 'the great injury done to the reputation of a dramatic author (and none other can be injured in the same way) by

'the circulation of spurious copies of his plays through the world. My five Haymarket pieces, locked up in MS., have been repeatedly printed and published surreptitiously (as well as those of other authors), and are full of the most glaring errors. I heard read to me by my brother these my early productions, in which were passages and expressions that never came from my pen.'¹

Sigmond, in his *Sheridan's Works* (1848), was obviously referring to this text when he wrote:

'We unfortunately possess no printed copy of this play authenticated by its author: some incorrect editions have been printed. The one which appeared in Ireland in the year 1788 has been usually followed, and although pronounced incorrect, it has greater pretension to be "authority" than any we possess, for it is taken from the manuscript which Sheridan forwarded to his sister for the use of the manager of the Dublin Theatre, who gave her one hundred guineas and free admission for her family for the privilege of performing it.'

This passage, written in 1848, does not deserve very serious attention, for like the rest of Sigmond's preface it owes its foundation to Moore, but the interpretation is Sigmond's. In the first place, the existence of Moore's copy puts it beyond all doubt that he meant the edition of 1799, and not one of

¹ In order to show the rapidity with which the Irish pirates worked, I have tabulated the surreptitious issues of these five plays:

Play.	Produced.	Published.
<i>The Son in Law</i>	14 Aug. 1779	12mo, 1783, Dublin.
<i>The Dead Alive</i>	16 June 1781	12mo, 1783, Dublin.
<i>The Agreeable Surprise</i>	3 Sept. 1781	12mo, 1783, Newry.†
<i>The Young Quaker</i>	26 July 1783	12mo, 1784, Dublin.
<i>Peeping Tom of Coventry</i>	6 Sept. 1784	12mo, 1785, Dublin.‡

† Earliest edition previously recorded, 1784, Dublin. Nicoll, *Eighteenth-Century Drama*, 1750-1800.

‡ Earliest edition previously recorded, 1786, Dublin. Nicoll, *op. cit.*

1788. Moreover, all those who have collected and examined copies of the comedy—Anderson, Sichel, E. R. McDix, Percival F. Hinton, and myself—have seen only one Irish edition of 1788, described on the title-page as ‘The Fifth Edition’, and I can only suppose that it was a slip or misprint for 1783, a fairly common year. In any case, the text I have already quoted is the one that had ‘usually been followed’, not only in the numerous Dublin separate issues, but also in such publications as the *Collected Edition* of 1828 (Greenock) and in *The Acting Drama*, ‘containing sixty highly popular plays’ (Williamson, 1839).

The earliest printed edition of this spurious text that I have seen was published, without prologue and epilogue, in 1781, but I am satisfied, though I have never seen a copy, that this reprints a Dublin edition of 1780. It is certain that John Barnard, a member of the Bath company when Sheridan produced it there in 1777, reconstructed a piratical version at Exeter in 1799. I believe that it was a copy of his version that found its way into the hands of the Irish printer.

I am certain that it was not Ryder’s copy, and that the text does not represent Sheridan’s version in any intermediate state. This may be proved by setting out, side by side, (i) either Cumberland’s edition of 1826 or the Dublin edition of 1799, (ii) the late draft printed by Fraser Rae, and (iii) the early drafts printed by Thomas Moore, when there will be seen a perfectly orderly development, in idea and phrasing, into which scheme the spurious text will not fit. It becomes clear that the speeches have been written out from memory. The prompter always saw that the players’ parts were returned to him, if only because if they were not returned he would need to have them copied out again when the play was performed the next season, or with any new players. Consequently, an actor writing out his part a year or two years later would depend upon his memory, which, in days when they had

to play fifty parts in a year, can hardly have been exact. In short, I believe that the spurious text was put together by an actor who had acted in the play forty or fifty times, and in more than one character, with the assistance of other players similarly circumstanced. This is precisely what John Barnard did at Exeter.¹

For many years, until I challenged it in the preface to my edition of *An Ode to Scandal*, it was always accepted that the first edition of the comedy was an undated issue, 'Dublin, Printed for J. Ewling'. Anderson appears never to have read Moore's *Life of Sheridan*, or he would not have described Moore as editor of Murray's Collected Edition. Consequently he missed the reference to *The School for Scandal*. It was he who first guessed the date. On the last page (and not on a slip, as Mr. Sichel says) of the Ewling edition is a list of errata, which seems to have led, though I fail to see why, to the supposition that this was the first edition. At all events, no other reason has ever been advanced for the assumption, yet when I first saw a copy many years ago, having then no special knowledge of dramatic bibliography, I mentally dated it, from my general knowledge of printed plays, as belonging to the last decade of the eighteenth century. I believe this date will prove to be correct. Mr. Dix assures me that there was no Dublin printer named Ewling, though there were several named Ewing. Thomas Ewing printed many books—I have his Johnson's *Shakespeare* (12mo, 12 vols., 1771) and a Congreve (1773) in the same style, neat little volumes—which differ in every way from the badly printed Ewling octavo. In my opinion the imprint is false, a device of some obscure London printer, and the first booksellers who should be investigated as its instigators are Millar, Law, and Cater, who printed the unauthorized *Dramatic Works* of 1797. They also issued other plays and cheap school-books, which exhausts my impression

¹ Cf. Barnard, *Retrospections of the Stage*, 1833, quoted *Plays and Poems*, ii. 163.

of their activities. This is all guess-work, and needs a great deal of investigation. But I am sure that nobody will dispute my statement that when an undated edition is given priority over all dated editions, the burden of proof rests upon those who assert its precedence. With that I will leave the Ewling edition, and say firmly with Mr. W. J. Ryan that the earliest known edition of the spurious text—its *editio princeps*—is the Dublin edition of 1780.

But those who would like to prove that the text is not spurious, but genuine, may be presented with the strange fact that Sheridan in 1789 permitted it to be translated into French as *L'École du Scandale, ou Les Mœurs du Jour*, and even subscribed to a copy. The translator, Bunel Delille, described mysteriously how a manuscript of the play found itself one day on his desk, and asked the author's permission to transplant his flowers into another land.¹ Of course, it is not certain that, even if he had wanted to, Sheridan could have stopped Delille; and, knowing his peculiar propensity for practical joking, I suspect that he let it go at that, perhaps without even troubling to look at the manuscript about which the Frenchman told such a cock-and-bull story. But I will also add that it was translated from a better manuscript than was printed in 1780. For instance, in place of the already quoted 'Make a *Fête Champêtre* at a mas—' it read 'at Xmas', for Delille renders it '*à Noël*'. Also it confirmed a correction I have ventured to make for the first time in the text: Sir Peter, speaking of the expected visit of Sir Oliver, says (Act I, Scene ii), 'Well, he must be at my house—I'll instantly give orders for his Reception'.

Thus the readings of the editions of 1799 and 1826, which the edition of 1823 (that is, the Oxford text) amends to 'he must soon be at my house'. The spurious text also attempted a correction to 'But I must have him at my house'. With

¹ Cf. *Plays and Poems*, ii. 169.

a knowledge of eighteenth-century idiom, I made the obvious amendment, 'he must *lie* at my house'. And even spurious texts have their uses, for my conjecture is confirmed by Delille — 'qu'il logera chez moi'. Rae from the manuscripts still reads 'be at', which simply means that Sheridan had not dotted his 'i'.

It is not certain how much the sale of the copyright of *The School for Scandal*, about 1794, brought Sheridan. I should judge that it brought him £200. These are the facts upon which my inference is based:

Arthur Murphy, as counsel in the famous case of 'Miller against Taylor for printing Thompson's *Seasons*', said that under the Copyright Act of Queen Anne 'The price of Copies [of plays] has been continually increasing. Sir Richard Steele, 'in the meridian of his reputation, could get for *The Conscious Lovers* no more than £40.—The Comedy of *The Drummer*, 'written by so great a genius as Mr. Addison, was sold to 'Tonson for £50.—Sir Richard Steele mentions the fact, in 'a Letter to Mr. Congreve, prefixed to the Play of *The Drummer*.—Ever since that time, the price of plays has been 'increasing; insomuch that one hundred guineas is now the 'lowest sum offered for a new Play: a Farce of two Acts will 'sell for 50 or 60 guineas; and at the sittings at Guildhall, 'before Lord Mansfield, Mr. Bickerstaff (the author of *Love in a Village* and other Operas) recovered one hundred guineas 'for making a few alterations in Wycherley's Play of *The Plain Dealer*.'

The usual edition of a play was three thousand copies, and according to Murphy it had 'frequently happened of late that an entire edition of 3,000 is sold off in three or four hours'. The value of copyright before 1781, when Sheridan ceased to write comedies, was, therefore, at least 100 guineas for a five-act piece, and 40 to 50 guineas for a two-act farce. Paul Vaillant paid Murphy 40 guineas each for the farces of *The*

Upholsterer (1758) and *The Old Maid* (1761). For his five-act pieces, Murphy received 100 guineas each—this sum being paid by Vaillant for *The Orphan of China* (1760) and *The Way to Keep Him* (1761); by Griffin for *Zenobia* (1768), and for *The Grecian Daughter* (1772); and from Lowndes for *Alzuma* (1773).

Debrett gave Burgoyne £200 for *The Heiress* in 1786, but this was exceptional: he paid O'Keeffe £150 for *The World in a Village* in 1793. Mr. Sichel records that Sheridan received at least £1,000 for *Pizarro*, which I conjecture meant that his author's nights (including the twenty-first) brought him £800, and Ridgway paid £200 for the copyright. As he published twenty-six editions before the end of 1800 (the play was produced in May 1799), and this cost would be covered by the first two editions, this seems likely, though it requires further investigation.

It must be remembered that the sale outright of stage-right and copyright considerably diminished the interest of an author in the piratical adventures of his play. With percentages on performances and royalties on sales his activities would have increased, and the provincial managers and the Irish printers would have been brought into contribution half a century earlier than they were. Actually, English playbooks at eighteen pence had no sale in Ireland, where the price was a British sixpence, and English booksellers made little or no attempt to compete in the Irish market. Instead of his £520, Sheridan and his heirs would have received fees for *The School for Scandal* for London, provincial, and American performances, under modern conditions (at 10 per cent. of the gross takings) till 1856, when the copyright would have expired. The sum they would have received could not have been less than £2,000,000 on the theatre prices of the time.

Authors sometimes published at their own expense: Murphy's plays were sometimes printed 'for the Author', who

paid the expenses and took the profits. This was the case with *No One's Enemy but his Own* and *What we must all come to*, both printed by Vaillant for Murphy in 1764. Neither reached a second edition, and copies are rare. The instances (from Foote's *Murphy*, p. 308) must be exceptional. Subscription editions are in another class: the fine quarto of Macklin's *Love a-la-mode* and *The Man of the World*, edited by Murphy (ibid., p. 399), made a profit of some £1,500. But O'Keeffe's *Collected Works* brought him no profit. The edition was limited to 500 copies, the price of the four volumes being one guinea and a half. It barely paid its own expenses of paper, printing, advertising, and all other incidental affairs of that nature. He paid nothing to the owners of the copyrights, Harris and the booksellers. Advertising was not very expensive, however: Macklin's plays were advertised in seven London and two Dublin papers for £17 1s. od., nearly one-third of that sum going to Woodfall's *Diary*, obviously for many issues.

The Camp

It was not the custom to name the author of a new play on the bills or in the advertisements. In 1783, says O'Keeffe, 'my name was given as author in the play-bills the first night of *The Poor Soldier*, which was thought by the public great presumption, seeming as much as to say "As it is O'Keeffe's, we must receive it", yet, as Mr. Harris said to his friends, "the public did receive it, and were heartily glad to get it".' Therefore the original announcements concerning *The Camp* name no author, for it was very unusual for a living author's name to be given. All pieces were in theory anonymous, but the authorship was generally a *secret de Polichinelle*, and known to the newspapers and magazines. A general acquaintance with the periodical press of the time convinces me that their attributions—allowing for individual misunderstandings—were invariably correct, unless for exceptional reasons the name of the

author was deliberately concealed. And the periodical press unanimously said that Sheridan was the author of *The Camp*. Moreover, his friends like John Taylor; his partner in the King's Theatre in the Haymarket; Michael Kelly, the musical director of Drury Lane; and John O'Keeffe, all speak of *The Camp* as his play, as a matter of course, whether writing at the time or fifty years afterwards. Accordingly I have restored *The Camp* to the canon, from which it was deposed by Moore on the grounds that he found a transcript in Tickell's handwriting. And Tate Wilkinson also denied Sheridan's authorship, but his authority on such matters does not stand very high.

However, if there was any mystery about *The Camp* other than that of Thomas Moore's making, I should think that Sheridan had a collaborator whose identity it was desirable to conceal. Now, the piece is a patriotic squib, intended to celebrate the virtues of the militia and to expose the villainies of army contractors and the folly of the people of fashion who made a show-ground of the encampments. The satire is not very severe, though I suspect that the military knowledge that it reveals was not Sheridan's, but that of some soldier who had reasons for concealing his identity. One of the chief characters in *The Camp* is O'Daub, the Irish painter, from the afterpiece called *The Maid of the Oaks* (1774). The author of this play was General John Burgoyne, and I therefore suspect his hand in *The Camp*, but rather only as an adviser and corrector than as the author. The comedy, which is very slight, appeared in 8vo in 1795, with Sheridan's name, but the imprint gives no bookseller or printer, and it was included in the Authorized Collected Edition of 1821, and also in the Greenock edition of 1828.

The first Collected Edition of Sheridan's plays was issued by William Jones of Dame Street, Dublin, in 1795. There is some mystery about this volume, which has not been recorded

in any bibliography previous to mine. It seems that in 1791, the date on his edition of Bickerstaff's *Love in a Village*, he began to copy the style of the new issue of Bell's *British Theatre*, which began in that year, but in duodecimo instead of octavo, the lesser form adopted by John Bell himself in 1792, when he reissued his series with many additions. Jones in general took Bell's texts, which he reprinted *literatim*, except for his own imprint, at a later stage even copying Bell's engraved title-pages and frontispieces, and copying them very badly. At first he appears to have published a play a fortnight (this is deduction) and then to have conceived the plan of reprinting the entire series by subscription in Ireland, on rather better paper, and issuing volumes monthly, each consisting of four or five plays.

For the most part these volumes contain letter-for-letter reprints of his serial issues, with the original dates and printers on the title-pages, though both often differed from the date and printer of the new general title to each volume. With three exceptions the volumes have pagination to each play; vol. v contains four of Sheridan's plays (pp. 1-116): vol. vi contains three of Macklin's (pp. 1-202) with *The Governess* (pp. 1-60): vol. viii contains four of Burgoyne's plays. These are the first collected editions of their respective authors, and in each case copies are known without the general title of Jones's *British Theatre*, which is an inserted leaf. The Macklin volume in this state does not contain *The Governess* 'by R. B. Sheridan Esq'; this, however, is found added in some but not all of the copies of the Sheridan volume. All three volumes are found both with and without a portrait of the author as frontispiece. My own impression (and it claims to be no more) is that the continuous-paged Sheridan Collection of four plays was issued separately, in 1793 without the portrait, which was added for the subscribers' copies with the general title-page and the series in 1795.

But before leaving Jones's *British Theatre*, it should be added that in all his subscribers there is not one resident in England. Of three American booksellers, Thomas Stephens of Philadelphia took 125 sets, Isaac Beers of Newhaven, Conn., took two sets, and one single set was bought by Hugh Gaine of New York, who in 1786 printed, 'at the sign of the Bible in Hanover Square', the first American edition of *The School for Scandal*. Besides these, all the subscribers were Irish, so no attempt seems to have been made at a piratical trade, as understood at that time.

In conclusion, I have prepared a summary of the early editions of Sheridan's plays and poems, giving the first editions of the respective texts, whether spurious or authentic, together with parodies of the same or similar titles which have been confused with the genuine issues. In following the plan adopted in the Bibliographies of the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, I have noted the issues not there recorded, to give an indication of the progress that has been made in the last twenty years of Sheridan research. In these researches, my own contribution would have been much less if it were not for the generous assistance of Mr. Iolo A. Williams, Mr. E. R. McDix, Mr. W. J. Lawrence, and Mr. Percival Hinton. And more recently the textual and bibliographical problems of *The School for Scandal* have been discussed with admirable vigour and independence in *The Times Literary Supplement* by Mr. W. J. Ryan in his various contributions during April and May 1928.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

OF EARLY EDITIONS OF SHERIDAN'S PLAYS AND POEMS

Unless otherwise stated the imprint is London

The first Dublin edition is given only where it preceded the first London edition. Later editions are given only when they were printed from separate texts.

Parodies and political pamphlets are given where they have been confused through similarity of title with genuine first editions.

@ signifies an edition not recorded in the Sheridan Bibliography in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*.

1. EARLY COLLECTED EDITIONS

@ Pub. Jones; 12mo, 1795 (Dublin).

@ Pub. Millar; 12mo, 1797?

@ Pub. Murray (*pref.* Moore); 8vo, 1821, 2 vols.

Rpt., ed. Grant White; 1883 (New York), 3 vols.

@ 8vo, 1828 (Greenock).

2. SEPARATE PLAYS

THE RIVALS (Covent Garden, 17 Jan. 1775) (anon.), 8vo, 1775; @ Third Edition Corrected. 8vo, 1776.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY; or, THE SCHEMING LIEUTENANT (Covent Garden, May 1775); @ 8vo, 1788 (Dublin); ed. Daniel, 12mo, 1829.

THE DUENNA; or, THE DOUBLE ELOPEMENT (Covent Garden, 21 Nov. 1755); 8vo, 1794.

Songs, &c. @ (anon.) 8vo, 1775.

Imitation. @ THE GOVERNESS, 12mo, 1777 (Dublin). *Rptd. as* @ THE DUENNA, 12mo, 1783 (*spurious text, imprint London, but most likely Dublin*).

Parody: @ THE DUENNA: A Comic Opera (*political*); 8vo, 1776. (*Attributed to Israel Pottinger.*)

A TRIP TO SCARBOROUGH. ALTERED FROM VANBRUGH'S RELAPSE (Drury Lane, 24 Feb. 1777); 8vo, 1781.

THE SCHOOL FOR SCANDAL (Drury Lane, 8 May 1777). @ Taken from a Correct Copy; 8vo, 1799 (Dublin). @ Pub. Murray, 1823. @ ed. Daniel, 12mo, 1826.

Spurious text: @ 1780 (Dublin); 12mo: *numerous rpts.*

Parodies: @ 12mo, 1779. @ 12mo, 1784.

THE CAMP (Drury Lane, 15 Oct. 1778). @ 8vo, 1795. @ *ed.* Daniel, 12mo, 1832.

THE CRITIC; or, A TRAGEDY REHEARSED (Drury Lane, 30 Oct. 1779); 8vo, 1781.

Parody: @ 'By the Author of the Duenna'; 8vo, 1780.

Pamphlets: @ THE CRITIC ANTICIPATED; or, HUMOURS OF THE GREEN-ROOM; 8vo, 1779. @ THE CRITIC; or, A TRAGEDY REHEARSED. A LITERARY CATCHPENNY; 8vo, 1779.

PIZARRO; or, THE SPANIARDS IN PERU (Drury Lane, 24 May 1799); 8vo, 1799.

3. POEMS

1771. THE LOVE EPISTLES OF ARISTÆNETUS. Translated from the Greek into English Metre. @ (anon.); 8vo, 1771. [By Sheridan and Nathaniel Brassey Halhed.]

1771. THE RIDOTTO AT BATH. A Panegyric: @ (anon.); 4to, 1771.

Rpt. in Clio's Protest; 8vo, 1819.

1772. THE RIVAL BEAUTIES. A Poetical Contest. @ (anon.); 4to, 1772.

Contains: The Bath Picture (*by* Miles Peter Andrews?) and Clio's Protest; or, The Picture Varnished (*by* R. B. Sheridan).

1774. A FAMILIAR EPISTLE to the Author of the Heroic Epistle to Sir William Chambers, and of the Heroic Postscript to the Public. @ (anon.); 4to, 1774.

A reply to Mason . . . attributed to Sheridan, *European Magazine*, 1782.

Cf. Sichel, *Sheridan*, vol. i, p. 401.

1779. VERSES TO THE MEMORY OF GARRICK. Spoken as a Monody. 4to, 1779.

1781. AN ODE TO SCANDAL. @ (anon.); 4to, 1781 (Cambridge?); @ (anon.); 4to, 1781 (London): 'By the Rt. Hon. R. B. Sheridan'; 8vo, 1819.

Ed. R. Crompton Rhodes, 1927 (Oxford).

Attributed also to George Tierney.

AN INTERRUPTION IN THE PRINTING OF THE FIRST FOLIO

By EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY



IN the London edition of the *Mess Katalog* of the Frankfort book-fair are advertised two books printed at the Jaggard press which were to have been sold at the Autumn Mart, held in October 1622, but were delayed in publication. One of these is André Favyn's *Theater of Honor and Knight-hood*, from the press of William Jaggard. The other is entered as 'Playes written by M. William Shakespeare all in one volume, printed by Isaack Jaggard, in fol.'¹ Both of these books bear the date 1623 upon their title-pages, and although Favyn's *Theater* was entered on the Stationers' Register on 23 October 1622, and Shakespeare's First Folio not until 8 November 1623, both were sent to Wildgoose, the Bodleian binder, on the same day, 17 February 1624.²

The publication of the First Folio, then, was held back for more than a year. Difficulties over copyright have been conjectured as the cause of this delay. These troubles may have been present, but an hypothesis which attempts to account for the postponement of the First Folio and leaves without explanation the seemingly parallel case of Favyn's *Theater* is open to serious objections. Fortunately, there exists some bibliographical evidence from which may be deduced a more plausible cause for the delay.

In 1622 William Jaggard published Augustine Vincent's

¹ F. P. Wilson, 'The Jaggards and the First Folio of Shakespeare', in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 5 November 1925, p. 737.

² S. Gibson, *Early Oxford Bindings*, p. 58.

Discoverie of Errours in the First Edition of the Catalogue of Nobility . . . by Raphe [sic] Brooke. This book and the two works issued in the following year have a tailpiece in the centre of which is depicted a seated satyr holding two cornucopias. Two defects may be found in this ornament. The first appears on the top line between the cornucopia held in the monster's left hand and the end of the print. This flaw is found in every tailpiece in the three books. The second defect, also a break in the top line of the ornament, appears immediately above the cornucopia held in the satyr's right hand. It is this imperfection, which appears in at least one tailpiece in each of these three books, with which we are here concerned, and its significance becomes apparent when the order of its presence and absence is noted in the end-decorations of each of the three works.

In the First Folio twenty-four out of thirty-six plays have at their ends tailpieces. Of these the Comedies—with the exception of *Winter's Tale*, which is known to have been printed after the two plays which follow it in the bound volume—and the first of the Histories, *King John*, have this ornament without the second blemish (sigs. G 6v, I 2r, S 2r, V 1r, Y 1v, Z 6r, b 5v). *Winter's Tale*, the remaining Histories beginning with I *Henry IV*, and the Tragedies, however, have their tailpieces marred by this defect (sigs. Cc 2r, f 6r, gg 7v, k 2r, m 2r, o 3v, q 4v, t 2v, x 4v, ¶¶¶ 1v, ee 2v, hh 5v, ll 5v, qq 1v, vv 6r, zz 2v, bbb 6r).

In Favyn's *Theater of Honour*, likewise, the tailpieces at the end of The Contents and of Booke 1 are without the second break in the top line of the ornament (sigs. ¶ 3r, E 6v). The remaining tailpieces, those at the end of Bookes 2, 5, 7, and 10, however, have both of these defects (sigs. Cc 5v, i 3r, bb 1r, aaa 3v).

Vincent's *Discoverie of Errours*, moreover, has but two tailpieces. The first of these is unmarred by the second flaw

(sig. Nnnn 3v), but the defect is present when the ornament appears sixty-three pages later (sig. Xxxx 3r).

It is an axiom in bibliographical investigation that unless there can be adduced some reasonable evidence of mending, every impression made from an ornament marred with a certain defect was printed after those impressions which show the block free from that particular flaw. It then ensues as a corollary, that those plays of Shakespeare's First Folio and those divisions of Favyn's *Theater of Honour* which are followed by tailpieces unblemished by the second defect were printed before the later pages of Vincent's *Discoverie*, despite the fact that the latter work was published before the other two. Given these facts, we may now inquire as to the cause of the delay in the publication of Favyn's *Theater of Honour* and the First Folio of Shakespeare.

In 1621 Jaggard was probably printing both the works of Favyn and of Shakespeare. Already, it would seem, he had had trouble with Ralph Brooke, whose *Catalogue and Succession of Kings* he had printed in 1619; and despite the fact that he still had left 'rotting by the walles' two hundred copies, he consented to print a corrected edition of the work which would give Brooke's enemy, Augustine Vincent, an opportunity to castigate him. Jaggard entered the new version in the Stationers' Register on 29 October 1621. When this entry was made, despite the fact that Jaggard owned the copyright, Brooke determined, if he had not done so previously, to produce a new edition of his work in which as far as possible the errors of the first edition would be blamed upon the printer. Brooke's book was evidently printed in haste. For the purpose of forestalling Vincent's *Discoverie*, we learn from Jaggard's preface to that work (sig. ¶ 5v), 'he posted in such haste, night and day, but especially by night, to re-print at his owne charge and the Printer's perill, that unauthorized Edition'.

If Brooke considered it necessary to 'post in such haste' to

forestall the publication of Vincent's *Discoverie* of his errors, we may be confident that after 29 October 1621 Jaggard was pushing his book to completion with all possible speed. But besides speed, accuracy was needful. Jaggard could not refute the accusation which appeared on the title-page of the second edition of Brooke's *Catalogue* that the mistakes of the first edition were 'faults committed by the Printer in the time of the Authors sicknesse' with a book which teemed with errors. The most ready way to attain speed and accuracy in the printing of Vincent's *Discoverie* would be to interrupt the printing of Favyn's *Theater of Honour* and Shakespeare's First Folio and to devote himself and his shop to the completion of this controversial work, in the printing of which, in all probability, the tailpiece was for a second time damaged. The order of the appearance of this second defect in the end decoration leaves little doubt that this course was followed.

It now remains for us to ascertain the exact point at which Jaggard interrupted the printing of the First Folio. The evidence of the tailpieces, as we have seen, proves that the interruption did not take place before the end of *King John* nor after the end of *1 Henry IV*. Other typographical evidence shows quite conclusively that the interruption occurred between pages 24 and 25 of the Histories, at the end of quire b, the second page of *Richard II*. At this point there is a break-up in the rules and running title, and, what is even more significant, a change in the fount of type which is employed to print the pagination numerals.

After this interruption there is every reason to believe that the printing of the First Folio went on continuously, at least until it was for a second time decided to add *Troylus and Cressida* to the volume. The headings for Act I of the First Folio fall into successive series, and every member of each series was printed from the same setting of type and quads. With the exception of *Troylus and Cressida*—which is known

266 *An Interruption in the Printing of the First Folio*

to have been printed after even the preliminary matter—all the plays which have their tailpieces marred by the second defect have for the caption of their first acts a heading which was printed from the same setting of type and quads.¹ It is improbable that this same setting would be employed for the captions of these plays had the work been again interrupted, so we may be fairly certain that the printing of the First Folio from the third page of *Richard II* to the beginning of the present form of *Troilus and Cressida* pursued a troubled but continuous course.

Bibliographical evidence, then, seems to point to the following conclusions: Jaggard, in 1621, was printing Favyn's *Theater of Honour* and Shakespeare's First Folio, but was forced to stop work upon them to bring out Vincent's *Discoverie of Errours*. This interruption delayed the publication of the First Folio for over a year.

THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY, CHICAGO.

¹ E. E. Willoughby, 'The Heading, *Actus Primus, Scaena Prima*, in the First Folio', in *Review of English Studies*, iv (1928), 323-6.

TROILUS AND CRESSIDA, 1609

By PETER ALEXANDER



TROILUS and Cressida presents a group of problems not the most difficult or important but perhaps the most varied that requires consideration from the student of Shakespeare's text.

There is to begin with the problem of its entry in the Stationers' Register. On 7 February 1603 Roberts the printer entered for his copy, *The booke of Troilus and Cresseda as it is acted by my lord Chamberlens Men*.¹ It is not assigned to him as was customary by one of the Wardens, but *in full Court*; nor is the entry unconditional, but the book is *his to print when he hath gotten sufficient aucthority for yt*. The play was entered again on 28 January 1609, but in more normal fashion.

Richard Bonion, Henry Walleys. Entred for their copy under thandes of Master Segar deputy to Sir George Bucke and Master Warden Lownes a booke called the history of Troylus and Cressida.

Bonion and Walley, unlike Roberts, followed up their entry and published a quarto edition in 1609. What was the purpose behind Roberts's entry?

The quarto publication provides the next difficulty. There is only one edition of the play dated 1609, but there are two title-pages. One reads,

THE HISTORIE OF TROYLUS AND CRESSEIDA.

As it was acted by the Kings Maiesties seruants at the Globe. Written by William Shakespeare.

the other,

THE FAMOUS HISTORIE OF TROYLUS AND CRESSEID.

Excellently expressing the beginning of their loues, with the conceited wooing of Pandarus Prince of Licia. Written by William Shakespeare.

¹ 1602/3] 7 Februarii. *Master Robertes. Entred for his copie in full Court holden this day to print when he hath gotten sufficient aucthority for yt, The booke of Troilus and Cresseda as it is acted by my lord Chamberlens Men.*

The issue with the second of these title-pages contains a preface which contradicts the statement on the title-page of the other issue (*As it was acted by the Kings Maiesties seruants at the Globe*), by informing the reader that *you haue heere a new play, neuer stal'd with the Stage, neuer clapper-clawd with the palmes of the vulger*. Since the issue with the first title-page is made up in a normal manner with the title on the leaf signed A1, with A2, A3, and A4, following in due course, while the other title is on one of two leaves, the second, with the Preface, signed ¶2, followed by A2, A3, A4, the order of the issues is unmistakable. It is clear, in spite of Creizenach's doubts, that the original leaf, A1, was torn out, and replaced by the two leaves with the new title and preface. Some one must at the last minute have informed the publishers that the play they had printed had never been performed at the Globe nor indeed before any public audience: the publishers thereupon inserted the new title-page and the preface. But although the order of the issues may be regarded as settled beyond question, the statements in the preface about the circumstances attending the play's production and publication raise other difficulties.

To the problems of the double registration, and the double issue of 1609, we must add those of what may be called its double entry in the Folio. Heminge and Condell originally intended to place it immediately after *Romeo and Juliet*; but, when three pages, numbered 78, 79, and 80, were printed, they changed their mind and placed it between the Histories and Tragedies. It stands there in isolation without pagination, except 79 and 80 on the second leaf, a relic of its former position, and without any record in the table of contents which might have attached it to one or other section. Heminge and Condell have therefore added to the questions that can be asked about the play.

A beginning at least may be made in looking for answers by comparing the texts; and we must ask how the Folio editors

treat the Quarto text, and what criticism of it seems implied in the version they issued in 1623. In his *Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos*¹ Professor Pollard notes, 'Quarto text not used by Folio editors'. Professor Pollard does not necessarily, as he informs us, give his own view in these notes on the relations of the Quartos to the Folio, but usually that of the editors of the Quarto Facsimiles. There is general agreement, however, on *Troilus and Cressida*,² and it has been customary to argue, as Lee³ has done, that Heminge and Condell 'evinced distrust of the Quarto edition by printing their text from a different copy'; Mr. Crompton Rhodes agrees that they refrained from using the Quarto as it was 'stolen wares'.⁴ But a comparison of the texts seems to justify the following conclusions:

I. *The copy for the 1623 version of 'Troilus and Cressida' consisted of a Quarto text corrected from a manuscript in the possession of Heminge and Condell.*

If Clark and Wright's text is taken as the standard⁵ of comparison, we have among the errors common to the Quarto and Folio the following significant corruptions or mistakes;

- (1) I. i. 37. Clark and Wright read 'storm'.
Quarto. I haue (as when the Sunne doth light a scorne)
Folio. I haue (as when the Sunne doth light a-scorne)
- (2) I. ii. 183. Clark and Wright read 'shrewd'.
Quarto. Thats *Antenor*, he has a shrow'd wit
Folio. That's *Antenor*, he has a shrow'd wit
- (3) I. iii. 54. Clark and Wright read 'Retorts'.
Quarto. Retires to chiding fortune.
Folio. Retyres to chiding Fortune.

¹ p. 58.

² This is no longer so, since Dr. Greg this year in his Shakespeare Lecture to the British Academy has anticipated the conclusion here come to about the relation of Quarto to Folio, and has no doubt already persuaded many to question the accepted view.

³ *A Life of Shakespeare*, p. 369. ⁴ *Shakespeare's First Folio*, pp. 26, 108.

⁵ The numbering of the lines is that of Clark and Wright (1893).

- (4) III. ii. 129. Clark and Wright read 'Cunning'.

Quarto. see see your sylence
 Comming in dumbnesse, from my weaknesse drawes.
Folio. see, see, your silence
 Comming in dumbnesse, from my weakenesse drawes.

- (5) III. iii. 178. Clark and Wright read 'give'.

Quarto. And goe to dust, that is a little guilt
 More laud then guilt ore-dusted.
Folio. And goe to dust, that is a little guilt,
 More laud then guilt oredusted.

- (6) IV. ii. 31. Clark and Wright read 'capocchia'.

Quarto. alas poore wretch : a poore *chipochia*
Folio. alas poore wretch : a poore *Chipochia*

- (7) IV. iv. 121. Clark and Wright read 'zeal'.

Quarto. To shame the seale of my petition to thee :
Folio. To shame the seale of my petition towards,

- (8) IV. v. 143. Clark and Wright read 'Oyes'.

Quarto. On whose bright crest, fame with her lowdst (O yes)
Folio. On whose bright crest, fame with her lowd'st (O yes)

- (9) V. ii. 13. Clark and Wright read *Cres.*, as it is obviously to Cressida, not Calcas, that Diomed is speaking.

Quarto. *Di.* Will you remember? *Cal.* Remember yes :
Folio. *Di.* Will you remember? *Cal.* Remember? yes.

- (10) V. v. 12. Clark and Wright read 'Thoas'.

Quarto. *Amphimacus* and *Thous* deadly hurt,
Folio. *Amphimacus*, and *Tbous* deadly hurt ;

Clark and Wright also change *Epistropus* and *Cedus* at line 11 to *Epistrophus* and *Cedius*, but as the former spellings are found in Caxton they are no doubt Shakespeare's too : Caxton, however, spells *Thoas*.

It is no doubt possible for two compositors working independently on the same manuscript to make the same mistakes, misled by peculiarities in their copy : but in the foregoing list the second and ninth instances are not due to anything in the copy but to mere inadvertence on the part of the Quarto com-

positor. In their anxiety to insert the necessary apostrophes in the shortened forms of the past participle, the printers, prompted by the sight of a 'd', frequently add them where they are not required, as in 'cloud' and 'loud'; the Folio printer is much more free with these marks than the Quarto printer, but at i. ii. 183 he has been misled by his predecessor; he has also followed his slip in spacing the type at iv. v. 143.

In addition to these corruptions common to the versions the Folio and Quarto share certain readings which, though not recognized as errors by Clark and Wright, are unlikely in independent texts. Among these we may note:

(11) III. iii. 4.

Quarto. through the sight I beare in things to loue
I haue abandon'd Troy
Folio. through the sight I beare in things to loue,
I haue abandon'd Troy,

There can be little doubt that Calcas is referring to his gift of prophecy and that we must read 'things to come'; if the phrase 'sight in things to loue' could have a meaning it would not do in this place, where Calcas describes himself, become

As new into the world, strange unacquainted.

The misreading of 'come' as 'love' by the Quarto printer has a parallel in his version of the passage given in the Folio as

our head shall go bare till merit crowne it

where for 'crowne' the Quarto has 'louer' (III. ii. 89).

(12) II. iii. 87, where both Quarto and Folio spell *Achillis*, though elsewhere it is always *Achilles*. This list could be extended very considerably.

As well as these corrupt or unusual readings the Folio has other errors or misarrangements which seem to have been suggested to the printer by the Quarto text. The Rev. H. P. Stokes, the editor of the Facsimile Quarto, although he did

not regard the Folio as in any way following the Quarto, noted :

The Folio is careful to give a separate line to the commencement of *each speech* ; indeed this fondness for fresh lines is so great that if Q. by mistake has a new paragraph, F. is sure to 'say ditto' (see i. ii. 135 ; iii. i. 147, 151, 156 ; iii. ii. 42, &c.).¹

This belief of the Folio printer in a new line for each speech seems in one instance to have helped him to misinterpret the Quarto arrangement : (13) at iii. i. the dialogue between Helen, Paris, and Pandarus reads in the Quarto from line 48 :

Par. You have broke it cozen : and by my life you shall make it whole againe,
you shall peece it out with a peece of your performance. *Nel.* he is full of
harmony :

Pan. Truly Lady no : *Hel.* O sir :

The Folio gives the third line as

your performance. *Nel.* he is full of harmony.

Helen is later called *Nell* (with two *l*'s) by Paris ; but here the reply of Pandarus, 'Truely Lady no', indicates that the Quarto *Nel.* is a misprint for *Hel.*, and that this and the slip of beginning the speech with a small letter (several times repeated, as at iii. ii. 141 and v. i. 25) have confirmed the Folio printer in his belief that there is no new speech in the line. We should read,

Paris. . . . piece of your performance.

Helen. He is full of harmony.

Pand. Truly Lady, no.

Other Folio errors directly suggested by some mistake or peculiarity in the Quarto text include :

(14) iv. i. 39, where the Folio reading 'To *Calcha's* house' comes directly from the Quarto '*Calcho's*'.

(15) v. ii. 165.

Harke Greek : as much I doe Cressida loue ;
So much by weight, hate I her Diomed

¹ Introduction, p. vii.

The 'a' has been added to Cressid to restore the syllable inadvertently dropped in the Quarto

Harke Greeke, as much I do Cressid loue

where a second 'as', after 'much', has obviously been omitted.

(16) 1. iii. 20.

But the protractiue trials of great loue,

where 'loue' is a misreading of the Quarto *Ioue* owing to the italic *I* having been printed like *l*.

(17) v. ii. 120.

Quarto. That doth inuert th,attest of eyes and eares

Folio. That doth inuert that test of eyes and eares ;

In correcting the inverted apostrophe the Folio compositor or corrector has introduced a fresh error.

These and other links between the texts Clark and Wright thought due to the common manuscript from which they supposed the printers to have worked independently, at an interval of fourteen years. In the meantime the manuscript had been, they thought, revised and slightly altered by the author himself ; another hand had also tampered with it before 1623. This explanation is not open to those who think that the manuscript used by Bonion and Walley was a stolen one, unless they conjecture that Heminge and Condell stole it back again ; they must explain the common corruptions and coincidences between the texts on some other ground than that of a common manuscript ; as this shuts them off from any reasonable alternative to the theory that the Quarto was used in printing the Folio, they must give up the argument that Heminge and Condell mark it as stolen by neglecting it. But even the common manuscript postulated by Clark and Wright hardly explains those particular Folio errors which seem due to some typographical defect in the Quarto ; nor does a study

of the variant readings introduced by the Folio confirm the view (which necessarily accompanies the theory of a common manuscript) that the Folio gives a later version of the play than that available in 1609.

II. *The Quarto gives a later draft of the play than that in the possession of Heminge and Condell from which it was corrected.*

In the Folio at v. iii, as in the Quarto, Pandarus enters with a letter from Cressida to Troilus, who tears it across and gives its empty words to the winds: he replies, as Pandarus tries to detain him,

Pand. Why, but heere you?

Troy. Hence brother (*read* brocker) lackie; ignomie (*read* ignominy) and shame

Pursue thy life, and liue aye with thy name.

The interruption and reply are found, at this point, only in the Folio, but in the last scene in both Folio and Quarto they appear again. Troilus is leading the Trojans from the field where Hector has just been slain;

Enter Pandarus.

Pan. But here you, here you.

Troy. Hence broker, lacky, ignominy, shame

Pursue thy life, and liue aye with thy name.

Exeunt all but Pandarus.

Thus Pandarus is left in possession of the stage to speak the epilogue. There can be little doubt that the passage belonged originally to the earlier scene where Pandarus enters with the letter, crying,

Do you heere my lord, do you heere.

and that it was transferred to permit of Pandarus making his only appearance on the field so that he might conclude the entertainment on the key that predominates throughout.

The lines with which Agamemnon interrupts Ulysses at

1. iii. 70 in the Folio have been regarded as an addition to the Quarto text :

Speak Prince of Ithaca, and be't of lesse expect :
That matter needlesse of importlesse burthen
Divide thy lips ; than we are confident
When rank Thersites opes his Masticke iawes
We shall hear Musicke, Wit, and Oracle.

But it is more likely they were omitted for the sake of directness and intelligibility. This is the point in a number of changes which distinguish the Quarto from the Folio ; the 'whinid'st leauen' of the Folio (11. i. 14), for example, is changed to 'unsalted leauen', and 'the ill Aspects of Planets euill' (1. iii. 92) becomes simply 'the influence of euill Planets'. One or two longer passages seem to have been rewritten very hastily, Shakespeare being content to make the passage clear without improving on his first draft (e. g. 1. iii. 357-365). The change at iv. ii. 72 of the Folio,

the secrets of nature
Have not more gift in taciturnitie

into 'the secrets of neighbor Pandar' is a curious one : no doubt the Folio phrase is in the abstract the better of the two ; but which is the more appropriate in the text is not so obvious, and if there was no clue to the relationship between the texts it would be a nice problem to decide which was the 'harder reading'.

Between the opinion that the Quarto text was used in preparing the copy for the 1623 version, and that maintained by Clark and Wright which finds a common manuscript behind them, there is no room for a third explanation : the bibliographical links connect the texts too closely to admit of it. There is no textual reason therefore for regarding the Quarto as a version disowned by Heminge and Condell. Clark and Wright do not seem to have been troubled by the statement in the Preface which is generally taken as a confession by

Bonion and Walley that they knew that the manuscript from which they were printing was stolen, for their view on the relation of the texts contradicts the usual interpretation; those, however, who do not accept the textual conclusions of the Cambridge editors must offer some explanation of the final sentences in the preface.

The critical sentence is that about the 'grand possessors'. The reader, or prospective purchaser, has been informed that the play is a novelty, more of a novelty than the usual dramatic publication, for the play has never been performed in public; that it is the work of Shakespeare, *a birth of your braine, that neuer under-tooke any thing commicall, vainely*, as worthy of study as the comedies of Plautus or Terence; and as a final inducement that since printed versions of Shakespeare's plays are likely to become rare he should not miss the opportunity of purchasing this one, even though it is not talked about at the Globe. The Quarto is recommended not only as the version of a masterpiece but as something not to be picked up every day; for the policy of the grand possessors, the Company who own the play, it is declared, will prevent it.

It is of course customary for advertisers to announce that their goods are desirable and rare, but in the present instance the writer seems to indicate that Shakespeare Quartos as a class were liable to restriction¹ and to recommend this new publication as one of that limited kind. *Them* in the phrase *you should haue prayd for them* is here taken as referring to his *Commedies* seven lines above, and the sentence as meaning that if the Players could have had their way none of them, any more than this one, would have been published; readers would have been left to pray for them, not been prayed to purchase them. The qualifying phrase *I beleeeue* indicates that the writer is referring to the publication in general of Shakespeare's plays, not to this

¹ Not by the demand, since there was a search for them, nor presumably by the printers. The writer is not of course thinking of the search for *first* editions.

particular venture : had Bonion and Walley stolen the licensed prompt book from the King's Men as Mr. Crompton Rhodes suggests, they would have known more precisely how the Players regarded their enterprise.

If this reading ¹ of the Preface is justified we need not suppose that the manuscript in the hands of Bonion and Walley was stolen any more than we need believe this about Fisher's copy for *A Midsummer Night's Dream* or that of *The Merchant of Venice*, which, like *Troilus and Cressida*, was entered provisionally to Roberts in 1598, before passing into the hands of a publisher. The double entry ² in the Register does not mark off *Troilus* as differing in the circumstances of its publication from certain other good Quartos ; the writer of the preface seems to associate it with other Shakespeare publications rather than distinguish it from them ; and it is not among the stolen and surreptitious editions denounced by Heminge and Condell, for it is not maimed and deformed as those were declared to be.

Another difficulty raised by the Preface is fortunately more easily and surely explained. The play is presented as never *clapper-clawd with the palmes of the vulger*, yet according to Roberts's entry it was played as early as 1602 by the Chamberlain's Men. Malone explained this apparent contradiction by supposing they performed it privately ; he imagined at Court,

¹ The view that the 'grand possessors' were not the Players but private owners of manuscripts or those who commissioned the play is attractive (see *A Life of Shakespeare*, by J. Quincy Adams, p. 349) ; but the writer's change to the plural with *them* tells as much against this view as against the more commonly accepted reading. The writer of this paper owes his conversion from a similar view to Professor Pollard.

² Mr. Crompton Rhodes considers Roberts's entry an attempt at piracy, so that, in his opinion, at least two manuscripts of *Troilus* were stolen from the Players : the first by Roberts in 1602 ; the other by Bonion and Walley ; for their version, he insists, must have been a revised one made after Buck became Master of the Revels in 1606, since it was endorsed by his deputy (*Shakespeare's First Folio*, p. 23).

as does Mr. Crompton Rhodes. If designed as a Court entertainment it was planned for that of Elizabeth, and it is obvious from the play itself that this is improbable. Elizabeth was not mealy-mouthed, nor did she give sarcenet surety for her oath; she spoke her mind like the lady that she was and enjoyed the rough and tumble of life—but she would not have had *Troilus and Cressida* at Court. Nor would Shakespeare have presented it there: he had wisdom enough to play the fool, and it was his business to observe the quality of person and the time for which he wrote. What he thought would be appreciated at Court can be studied in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. The humours of the buck-basket and Sir John's defeat by the virtuous wives were obviously in the right key for Elizabeth; throughout, that comedy maintains in certain vital matters due decorum; the whole tone of the play supports the tradition that it was specially written for the Queen. In *Troilus* all is different: there is much scurrility and the audience are at times addressed directly and familiarly by the most scurril character in the most scurril terms; and the play concludes with an epilogue which prevents disapproval by implying that there will be no hissing except from bawds or panders or their unfortunate customers. This was obviously not for the ears of her Majesty. Nor can these particular addresses be detached from the play as a whole: they are in keeping with the rest.

Shakespeare, however, may have written the play for some festivity at one of the Inns of Court. On an earlier occasion of the same kind at which Shakespeare's company supplied a part we hear of the wittily obscene speeches and can read the account of the proceedings with its allusions to the famous places of ill repute about London.¹ In 1611² the Benchers of the Inner Temple decided to prohibit the 'lewd and lascivious plays' which had brought 'disorder and scurrility' into their

¹ *A Life of Shakespeare*, by J. Quincy Adams, p. 210.

² *The Elizabethan Stage*, vol. i, p. 221.

entertainments, though they later went back on their decision. This recalls the note of Shakespeare's play; the subject and its treatment point to such an audience; the deliberate flouting of tradition as established by Homer and Chaucer would have been intelligible only to instructed spectators. The wife of Bath's fifth husband might have stopped 'To reden on his book of wikked wyves' for an evening to enjoy it: it is excellent fooling for clerks. It is unlikely that this play was ever performed to an audience at the Globe.¹

The assurance which the Preface gives us that the play was designed for some private occasion or company suggests that transcripts of the play may have been made for certain of those who commissioned it, and that one of these may have been obtained by Bonion and Walley. But such transcripts would hardly be made by Shakespeare himself, and the Quarto copy was most probably in Shakespeare's own handwriting. Three reasons may be given for this opinion.

1. If we accept the peculiarities of writing and spelling described by Professor Dover Wilson as Shakespeare's, the copy for *Troilus and Cressida* was written by him.²

Shakespeare, it is thought, spelt 'one' without final 'e', and though this form does not often pass the compositor, who usually normalized the spelling, the form 'on' is found in *Troilus* (III. iii. 155); 'a leuen' (for 'eleven') and 'els' (for 'else') are other characteristic Shakespearian spellings of simple words found in the Quarto. Professor Dover Wilson thinks Shakespeare often omitted the 'e' in words ending 'ce'; though he finds no examples of this having escaped the compositor in the Quartos, it is established from misprints;

¹ A performance at one of the Inns of Court would have provided a suitable audience for the incidental raillery of Jonson which some discover in the description of Ajax by Pandarus and the imitation of his action by Therites.

² *Shakespeare's Hand in Sir Thomas More*, and 'Spellings and Misprints in the Second Quarto of *Hamlet*' (*Studies for the English Association*, 1924).

but 'seat' for 'sense' in *Troilus* (1. iii. 252) is easily understood if we suppose Shakespeare to have written 'senc' (c and t being regularly confused, and 'sense' elsewhere in the Quarto being spelt 'sence'). Professor Dover Wilson includes this word among his *a*: *minim* misprints, the 'n' being taken for an open 'a'. A few among the many other spellings that show an orthography similar to that ascribed to Shakespeare are: hott, rott, reveng, pallat, challeng, mettell, sallutes, Herrald, pas, okes, clowd, ougly, ould, durt, fadomes, woodden, scoaffollage, coffe. The form 'commixtion' (iv. v. 124) has affinities in *Hamlet* Q2 and is explained by Professor Dover Wilson in his study of that Quarto.¹

The misprints of *Troilus* also suggest that the handwriting was similar to the hand in *Sir Thomas More*, which is Shakespeare's or very like it. One example will have to suffice. 'Some writers, including Shakespeare it seems, were in the habit of occasionally using a particular form of the letter "a", well known to palaeographers, which was liable to be mistaken for "or", and, in fact, is so misprinted in two passages of *Hamlet* (Q2; 1. ii. 96, 1. v. 56). We can imagine a writer using this form so persistently that a compositor might be led by force of habit to print "a" even where "or" was meant.'² *Troilus* reads 'a' for 'or' at 1. iii. 289. The same peculiarity explains in part 'out' for 'at' (11. i. 98).³

2. The punctuation of the Quarto is throughout dramatic.

We may assume as a rough working rule that the more dramatic the punctuation of a piece the nearer we may presume we are to the author's own pointing, and the less chance there is of an intermediate transcript in another hand, except

¹ p. 40.

² I have borrowed this wording of the matter from *Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare*, by Dr. Greg, p. 33.

³ For the same reason no doubt Q. 'faced' (the correct reading, though the Cambridge editions reject it) is changed in F. to 'forced', the handwriting in Shakespeare's original draft misleading the corrector.

of a very faithful kind between the printer and the author. Mr. Percy Simpson in his *Shakespearian Punctuation*, referring to the 1609 text of the sonnets, says the printer 'was at great pains to indicate the rhythm by the punctuation'; but Wyndham had claimed that Shakespeare himself and not the printer was the author of the most perfect examples of this rhythmical pointing. It was not of course Mr. Simpson's intention to insist on this distinction—he has proved his thesis without it—but many of the examples cited by him are clearly beyond the printer and indeed outside his province, however competent he may have been. It is a fair assumption that the printer left to his own resources would find grammatical punctuation simpler than the other, and we know that in reprinting some of the Quartos the compositors, released from the immediate authority of the manuscript, tended to eliminate the more ungrammatical stops. We cannot therefore suppose that the admirably dramatic punctuation of many passages in the Folio is merely the printer's interpretation of how the words should be taken: it can only be Shakespeare's own expression of his intentions. In the Quarto of *Troilus and Cressida* there is a more extensive and uniform use of dramatic stops than in any play as printed in the Folio. The Quarto shows the emphasis which the light and shade of this punctuation can give the meaning in its most expressive form: the grammatical relationships between the phrase are taken for granted. The Folio editors (or the printer's reader) no doubt felt that this was too extreme a method to employ in an edition for the great variety of readers; and, to take a single illustration of their method, the Folio text of *Troilus and Cressida* when compared with that of the Quarto shows that a compromise was attempted: grammatical points have been regularly introduced and where they existed already are frequently strengthened, the dramatic stops are often weakened or removed. The Folio punctuation has been edited as the Quarto has not.

Dramatic punctuation is most easily exhibited in the use of the heavier stops. In the following examples, the Quarto employs a full stop in the middle of an incomplete sentence which has been removed altogether in the Folio version or replaced by a comma.¹

III. iii. 272-275 :

procure safe-conduct for his person, of the magnanimous and most illustrious, sixe or seauen times honour'd Captaine Generall of the armie. Agamemnon, do this.

The Folio removes this mark of the humorous predominance of Achilles, and reads ;

Armie Agamemnon, &. doe this.

I. iii. 293-296 :

But if there be not in our Grecian hoste,
A noble man that hath no sparke of fire
To answer for his loue, tell him from me.
He hide my siluer beard in a gould beauer,

The rhetorical pause is not an affectation in a man of Nestor's age.

IV. iv. 132-133 :

He nothing do on charge, to her owne worth.
Shee shalbe priz'd :

Diomed rejects the injunctions of Troilus and pauses to emphasize the one reason why Cressida will be safe with the Greeks. The Folio omits the full stop and puts a colon after 'charge'.

V. i. 77-78 :

Old *Nector* (read *Nestor*) tarries, and you to *Diomed*.
Keepe *Hector* company an houre or two.

Achilles' anxiety to provide suitable company for his guest could not be better indicated.

¹ See *Shakespearian Punctuation*, pp. 79 et seq.

These are not isolated examples, for the full stop is regularly employed throughout the Quarto in this manner; so is the colon.

I. i. 50-51 :

I am madde :

In *Cressids* loue ?

III. iii. 138-140 :

why euen already :

They clap the lubber *Ajax* on the shoulder
As if his foote were one braue *Hectors* brest,

IV. v. 73-75 :

Tis done like *Hector*, but securely done,
A little proudly, and great deale misprising :
The knight oppos'd.

III. iii. 88-89 :

Fortune and I are friends, I do enjoy :
At ample point all that I did possesse,

The Folio text replaces the colon in the second example with a comma but leaves no trace of the others. The Quarto has many instances of the fine use of this stop. The other stops are employed in the same manner.

Nor does the Quarto weaken the dramatic value of its punctuation by an overloaded stopping such as Professor Dover Wilson finds in *Love's Labour's Lost*. The grammatical points are kept as inconspicuous as possible and frequently ignored altogether. One brief instance must suffice (I. ii. 73-76) :

Himselfe? no? hee's not himselfe, would a were himselfe, well the Gods are aboue, time must friend or end well *Troylus* well, I would my heart were in her body; no, *Hector* is not a better man then *Troylus*.

As in this example the Quarto frequently ignores the grammatical full stop which the Folio usually marks; but at this place the Folio merely stiffens the grammatical framework with a colon after 'end' and one at the beginning of the same

sentence before 'well'. One final instance must illustrate the compromise attempted in the Folio. At v. v. 30 the Quarto reads :

Oh courage, courage Princes, great *Achilles*,
Is arming, weeping, cursing, vowing vengeance,
Patroclus wounds haue rouz'd his drowzy bloud,
Together with his mangled *Myrmidons*
That noselesse, handlesse, hackt and chipt come to him.
Crying on *Hector*, *Ajax* hath lost a friend,
And foames at mouth, and hee is armde and at it :
Roaring for *Troylus*,

The Folio retains the dramatic stops at ll. 34 and 36, weakening the first, however, and filling in with a grammatical punctuation :

Oh, courage, courage Princes : great *Achilles*
Is arming, weeping, cursing, vowing vengeance ;
Patroclus wounds haue rouz'd his drowzie bloud,
Together with his mangled *Myrmidons*,
That noselesse, handlesse, hackt and chipt, come to him ;
Crying on *Hector*. *Ajax* has lost a friend,
And foames at mouth, and he is arm'd, and at it :
Roaring for *Troylus* ;

After examining the punctuation of certain passages in the first Quarto of *Richard II*, Professor Pollard claimed that their 'colons and commas take us straight into the room in 'which *Richard II* was written and we look over Shakespeare's 'shoulder as he penned it'. To the question, however, whether *Richard II* was punctuated throughout in this manner he had to answer, 'In any positive sense it was not'.¹ But the punctuation of the Quarto of *Troilus* shows in a very consistent manner the hand of the author or one who could interpret his intentions as no compositor could or would venture to do. We may claim that the punctuation strengthens considerably the evidence of the spelling and misprints that the Quarto printer was working from Shakespeare's autograph.

¹ *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates* (second edition), p. xxi.

3. If the Quarto was not set up from Shakespeare's manuscript, which it is claimed was a slightly revised version in places, why did Heminge and Condell have to rely on an earlier draft?

If we reject the view that Bonion and Walley managed to obtain a transcript from private hands, and reject the interpretation of the Preface which makes them openly admit that they were guilty of theft, we can only suppose that Shakespeare himself decided to have *Troilus* printed. We do not know why, any more than we know why *A Midsummer Night's Dream* or *Much Ado* found their way into print. To give effect to his decision Shakespeare made a transcript, with a few alterations, in his own hand; the Master of the Revels, or rather his deputy, was asked to sign the manuscript, as his signature was now a sufficient authority for publication; the original book allowed by Tilney, or his deputy, remained with Heminge and Condell, the Company's managers. This of course is theory, not history, but so is the account it is designed to replace: all that is claimed is that the present story agrees better with the textual evidence and the statements in the Preface.

One problem remains for consideration, the position of the play in the Folio. The explanation of the change given by Mr. Rhodes seems the most satisfactory: that Heminge and Condell had it removed from its first position because it was not a tragedy. The difficulty in which Heminge and Condell found themselves is reflected in the troubles of the literary critics with the play.

Professor Saintsbury—the best of judges—has quite fairly pronounced it one of the least characteristic of Shakespeare's works; the author of the Preface seems to have thought differently. Though the latter affects the letter overmuch, he speaks to the point on Shakespeare's comic genius, and his words, 'when hee is gone, and his Commedies out of sale, you will

scramble for them, and set up a new English Inquisition', have taken on a prophetic note that entitles him to attention, although he may not have known that the new English Inquisitor would be an American. He thought that among all Shakespeare's comedies *there is none more witty than this*. The philosophic interpretations of the play omit this untranscendental element. To-day the play holds its readers by the magic of its thought and style; nor is this confined to the discourse of Ulysses, for Troilus speaks a more impassioned language to whose fascination the enthusiasm of Keats is not too great a tribute. But its action is of a different kind from those of the great tragedies. It is not the quintessence of thought and feeling, one entire and perfect chrysolite like *Hamlet* or *Othello*, but admittedly synthetic, a necessary substitute for the occasion, yet nevertheless a miracle of wit. This is what the Preface emphasizes, while it helps to explain the difficulty in defining the character of the piece. The first critic chose to call it a comedy, the Quarto title-page which may give Shakespeare's description names it a history, and the editors for a time at least thought it a tragedy. As this is the accepted view to-day there is warrant for their opinion, and some at least of the Quarto histories, like the history of *Lear*, were properly included among the Tragedies. There is no need to wonder at their indecision, since no one can be certain what they should have done with *Troilus*; their difficulty in placing it is in the end the same as ours in understanding it, and the Preface provides the necessary light on the literary as well as on the textual and bibliographical problem. The writer's information and criticism is entitled to the attention due to that of a well-informed and intelligent playgoer of the time, and the first words on the play provide the last word for any subsequent discussion of it. 'And so I leave all such to be prayd for (for the states of their wits healths) that will not praise it.'

EASTWARD HO, 1605

BY CHAPMAN, JONSON, AND MARSTON

BIBLIOGRAPHY, AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF PRODUCTION

By R. E. BRETTLE

FIRST EDITION. FIRST ISSUE. 1605

Title-page. Eastvvard / Hoe. / As / It was playd in the / Black-friers. / By / The Children of her Maiesties Reuels. / Made by / Geo: Chapman. Ben: Ionson. Ioh: Marston. / [two printer's ornaments side by side] / At London / Printed for William Aspley. / 1605.

Description. A-I (9 sheets, each 4 leaves).

A1 recto, title-page.

A1 verso, Prologus.

A2 recto, East-Ward Hoe. / Actus primi, Scena prima.

A2 recto to I4 verso, the play.

I4 verso $\frac{3}{4}$, Exeunt. / Epilogus . . . (at foot), Finis.

No pagination; head-lines throughout, beginning on A2 verso, each recto and each verso, 'Eastward Hoe', with variety of type and a misspelling (A3 recto—'Eastward').

The catchword on E3 verso is 'English-'; that on E4 recto, 'Spend,'.

Copy. No perfect copy of this first issue is known, but the nearest to perfection is to be found in the Ashley Library.¹ Mr. Wise's copy is imperfect in that it lacks the original title-page and has a substitute one from a third edition copy. My attention was first drawn to the imperfection by a statement in the *Catalogue* that line 5 of the Prologue in the Wise copy reads 'opposd', whereas according to second-issue copies the spelling should be 'opposde'.

¹ See the *Ashley Library Catalogue*, vol. i, p. 174. Mr. Wise very kindly gave me an opportunity of handling his copy.

FIRST EDITION. SECOND ISSUE. 1605

The title-page and description are the same as in the first issue except that the catchword on E3 verso is 'rously' and on E4 recto 'Enter'.

Copies. B.M. (C. 56, d. 32); Bodl. (Mal. 765); Dyce (2031); Huntington; Boston; Clawson (that was); Worcester Coll., Oxford.

A closer examination shows that the two leaves E3 and E4 have been entirely reset: there are differences in page- and line-adjustment, in type, capitalization, and spelling. Of the original leaves, two and a half lines at the bottom of E3 verso and four and three-quarter lines at the top of E4 recto were left out of the substituted leaves. The omitted passage is as follows:

'only a few industrious / Scots perhaps, who indeed are disperst ouer the face of the / whole earth. But as for them, there are no greater friends to / English men and *England*, when they are out an't, in the / world, then they are. And for my part, I would a hundred / thousand of 'hem were there, for wee are all one Countrey- / men now, yee know; and wee should find ten times more / comfort of them there, then wee doe heere.'

In the substituted leaves, the only addition¹ is of two lines and parts of two other lines on E4 recto (line 5 on). The added passage is:

'Besides, there we shall haue / no more Law then Conscience, and not too much of either; / serue God inough, eate and drinke inough, and *inough is as / good as a Feast.*'

It can easily be seen that the resetter had thus room for about four lines, which he used in more generous spacing and in different line- and page-adjustment.

Of the copies of the second issue, most show no evident signs of cancellation;² but the Bodleian copy (Mal. 765, a separately bound quarto) shows plainly two stubs between E4

¹ I have not called an addition that significant change: 'a Noble man' to 'any other officer' (E4 recto—first issue, l. 8; second issue, l. 2).

² I am reminded that a close examination of water and chain marks is needed.

and F1.¹ The old leaves E3 and E4 were apparently clipped off, leaving sufficient of their inside margin to take the stitching for E1 and E2; then the substitute leaves E3 and E4 were printed on one half-sheet and stitched in with the original leaves E1 and E2, whose stubs are left showing between the substitute leaf E4 and the first leaf of sheet F.

From the number and condition of the surviving copies of the first and second issues of the first edition of the play, it would seem that not many copies of the first issue were sold to the public, and that while some of the original E sheets were still unstitched or unbound, half of the inner and half of the outer formes of E were reset, so that (as in Bodl. Mal. 765) one half-sheet could replace the cancelled leaves E3 and E4, which were evidently cancelled before stitching or rough binding. As for the other copies of the second issue where there is no trace of stubs, the stubs may have been made unnoticeable by modern binding, although it is possible that copies of the second issue later than Mal. 765, i. e. copies whose E sheets were taken after the original stock of E sheets requiring to be cancelled had been exhausted, were made up from E sheets 'pulled' from the reset inner and outer formes of E.

The copy (no. 2031) of the second issue of the first edition of the play in the Dyce Library, South Kensington, is 'made up' like other books in that collection. Leaves E3 and E4 are preceded by two other leaves, apparently the cancelled E3 and E4 of the first issue, which have been inserted after E2 from a shorter and narrower copy, probably for the sake of completeness. Leaf F4 is a substitution from the same or a similar shorter and narrower copy.

¹ Malone 765 was bought from Longman & Co. in 1823 for £2 2s. 6d. by Peter Hall, who in 1826 exchanged it for an imperfect copy of another edition from Malone's library. Hall perhaps was the first to note 'every appearance of two leaves having been cancelled'. Cunliffe—*Representative English Comedies*, vol. ii, p. 412—made a more careful examination.

SECOND EDITION. 1605

Title-page. Eastvvard / Hoe, / As / It was playd in the
Black-friers. / By / The Children of her Maiesties Reuels. /
Made by / Geo: Chapman. Ben: Ionson. Ioh: Marston. / [two
ornaments side by side] / At London / Printed for William
Aspley, / 1605.

Description. A-H (8 sheets, each 4 leaves).

A1 recto, title-page.

A1 verso, Prologus (l. 5—spelling 'opposde').

A2 recto, Eastward Hoe. / Actus primi, Scena prima.

A2 recto to H4 verso, the play.

H4 verso $\frac{1}{2}$, Exeunt / Epilogus (in smaller type than the text).
 $\frac{1}{2}$, Finis.

No pagination; head-lines throughout, beginning on A2 verso, each verso and recto, 'Eastward Hoe', with inconsistencies of type and spacing.

Copies. B.M. (644. d. 53); W. A. White (now, I believe, Univ. Lib., Harvard).

In 1900 Greg (*List of Masques and Plays*, p. 19) noted differences enough between the two British Museum copies of the play, 644. d. 53 and C. 12. g. 4 (4)—both collating A-H in fours—to call them copies of different editions.

In 1922 Miss Bartlett (*Mr. William Shakespeare*, p. 164) printed some notes, privately communicated, from Dr. Greg's careful comparison of the various issues and editions of the play. I have used Greg's brief distinguishing marks there given. A discussion of the relation of the second and third editions to the first and to each other is given after the description of the third edition.

THIRD EDITION. 1605

Title-page. Eastvvard / Hoe, / As / It was playd in the
Black-friers. / By / The Children of her Maiesties Reuels. /
Made by / Geo: Chapman. Ben: Ionson. Ioh: Marston. / [two

ornaments side by side] / At London / Printed for William Aspley. / 1605.

Description. A-H (8 sheets, each 4 leaves).

A1 recto, title-page.

A1 verso, Prologus (l. 5—spelling 'opposd').

A2 recto, Eastward Hoe. / Actus primi, Scena prima.

A2 recto to H4 verso, the play.

H4 verso $\frac{1}{2}$, Exeunt / Epilogus (in type larger than the text).
 $\frac{3}{4}$, Finis.

No pagination; head-lines throughout, beginning on A2 verso, each verso and recto, 'Eastward Hoe', with variety of type and spacing.

Copies. B.M. (C. 12. g. 4 (4)); Bodl. (Mal. 252 (10) and Mal. 241 (6)); Forster (S. Kensington—two copies); Huntington; Trin. Coll., Cambridge.

There can be no doubt now that the two British Museum copies, 644. d. 53 and C. 12. g. 4 (4), and others like them, belong to two different editions both set up more economically after the second issue of the first edition. Of Greg's full reasons for assigning 644. d. 53 to the second edition and C. 12. g. 4 (4) to the third, I only know the brief notes given by Miss Bartlett, namely, that in 644. d. 53 the spelling in line 5 of the Prologue is 'opposde' and the Epilogue is in smaller type than the text, while in C. 12 g. 4 (4) the spelling is 'opposd' and the Epilogue is in larger type than the text. Probably Greg was only giving easy distinguishing marks, but I think there is little doubt that his ordering of the editions, which I follow, is correct.¹ In all likelihood the third edition was set up from the second, and the second edition certainly seems nearer than the third to the second issue of the first, in the type used, in spelling,

¹ I have since learned that Dr. Greg finds that, when the second edition was printed, the type of the first edition title-page was still standing and was used, but that for the third edition the type was reset. He points out that the third edition title is only distinguished from that of the first and second by having

and in capitalization. I give a few examples of the differences, using the numbers (1), (2), and (3) to indicate respectively the second issue of the first edition, the second and third editions.

The Prologue and Epilogue of (2) would appear to be set up in the same type as that used in (1), but reset.

(2 and 3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
A3 recto, l. 29	dis- / cent :	dis- / cent :	des- / cent
A4 verso, l. 16	ædefying	ædefying	ædefying
„ l. 31	Modestie !	Modestie !	Modesty !
B1 verso, l. 31	Gould. . . honour	Gol. . . honour	Goul. . . honor
B2 recto, l. 2	Ex. Gol. & Mil.	Ex. Gol. & Mil.	Ex. Goul and Mil.
B4 recto, l. 28	subtle <i>Quick silver</i> , These	subtle <i>Quicci</i> . These	subtle <i>Quic</i> . Those
E1 verso, l. 32	continuall	continall	continuall
E2 recto, l. 23	and pleadge	and pleadge	& pledge
F1 recto, l. 39	meanes	meades	meanes
F2 recto, l. 27	sal Achyme	sal Abime	sal Achime
F3 verso, l. 10	let we kisse	let we kisse	let me kisse
G4 recto, l. 3	<i>Kight</i>	<i>Kight</i>	<i>kite</i>
H1 recto, l. 38	The Light dos	The Light dos	The light do's

The height and breadth of the type-page of (2) and (3) are exactly the same (see C1 recto in each), and yet (3) in some way gives the impression of being more crowded typographically.

*Entry in the Stationers' Register.*¹

iiij^o Sept' 1605

Witthm Aspley Thomas Thorp Entred for their Copies vnder the hands of Mr Wilson and Mr feild warden A[n Ent *deleted*] Comedie called Eastward Ho:

Aspley's name alone appears on the title-page. 'Mr. Wilson' was probably the 'Mr. John Wilson' who gave authority for printing Marston's *Sophonisba* (17 March 1606; *Arber*, vol. iii, p. 316).

the B of By of the 'swash' variety. The two Bodleian copies of the third edition agree in having a comma-like stop after 'Hoe'; but this may be the result of a half-inked full point, such as probably gave the reversed comma after 'Aspley' in Mal. 252 (10).

¹ The reference to Arber's edition is iii. 300. I am indebted to Dr. Greg for the entry given.

Circumstances of Production.

The later limit for the date of production of the play is fixed by the entry in the Stationers' Register; the earlier limit by the reference in the Prologue to Dekker and Webster's *Westward Ho*, which was probably produced, as allusions would show, towards the end of 1604, and which appears as a cancelled entry in the Stationers' Register under the date 2 March 1605.¹

The nature of the passage omitted, and partly replaced in the two leaves reset for the second issue of the first edition of the play, would show that on the printing of the play offence was taken at the reference to the Scots, and that the offending passage had to be excised. But the play was apparently licensed for the press by a certain 'Mr. Wilson', and other possibly offending references were allowed to remain.² This licensing may have been done carelessly before the play was printed and one serious oversight remedied later.

In 1619 Jonson is reported to have said in conversation with Drummond that 'he was delated by Sir James Murray to the King for writing something against the Scots in a play Eastward Ho'.³

According to the evidence so far adduced, some doubt would seem to be cast on the commonly held view that trouble over *Eastward Ho* was occasioned by the first printing of the play. The fact of licensing for the press has already been noted, and

¹ Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, vol. iii, p. 295.

² As (first edition):

A4^v—Scotch farthingale.

B1^v—bought knighthoods.

C1^v—Court seas full of hazard.

F4^r—a 'stolen' knighthood and the mimicking of Scotch speech ('ken the man weel').

It is possible that a passage or passages were suppressed in proof, for A4^v, C1^v, C2^r, and perhaps A2^v (foot) to A3^r (top) are very widely spaced. This would suggest that the play was licensed for printing during printing.

³ Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, vol. i, p. 140 and notes.

cannot be gainsaid unless an illicit first printing be assumed. And then there is the great probability that any trouble over an Elizabethan or Jacobean play—any cause given for 'delation' or informing—would arise at its production and before its printing. Jonson's imprisonment for his share in *The Isle of Dogs* was due to the production of the play and not the printing. Chapman's trouble over his *Byron* play in 1608 was occasioned by its performance; and the author and actors of the 'mines' play (connected with *Byron* in the time and place of its performance) were sought for because of information given on the play's presentation.

It may indeed be argued that if trouble was over performance, care would have been taken that offending passages should not find their way to the printer; but the passage requiring cancelling may have been due to an oversight. Fleay suggested that other passages may have been withheld from the printer.

There is, however, other evidence which almost certainly refers to the same affair.

In the Cecil Papers¹ is a holograph endorsed '1605 Ben Jonson to my Lord'. A first draft of this letter to the Earl of Salisbury is to be found in a manuscript commonplace book,² together with nine other letters (six by Jonson and three by Chapman) which—although without dates—would seem to refer to the *Eastward Ho* imprisonment.³ And since the main

¹ Vol. cxiv, no. 58.

² Discovered and described by the late Mr. Bertram Dobell in *The Athenæum*, 23 and 30 March, 6 and 13 April 1901. Until recently the book was in the library of the late Mr. W. A. White of New York; it is now, I believe, in the University Library at Harvard.

³ Dobell printed three letters by Chapman and three by Jonson. Jonson's three others are printed by Herford and Simpson, *Jonson*, vol. i, of which see pp. 190-200. In the following account, Jonson's letters are referred to according to the numbers given them in Herford and Simpson's edition; Chapman's letters according to the order of their appearance in Bradley and Adams, *Jonson Allusion Book*, pp. 42-4.

question now at issue is whether trouble over *Eastward Ho* was caused by production or publication, an examination of the Jonson-Chapman correspondence with this question in mind is well worth while. Three of the ten letters are more important than the rest, and the less important will be dealt with first.

Jonson 1 was probably written to the Earl of Suffolk, then Lord Chamberlain. In it Jonson states that he is not only grieved at his imprisonment, since it was caused by his Majesty's displeasure, but at the manner of it, for he was committed unexamined and unheard and made to appear guilty before he really was. He calls God, and the posterity that will read his writings now neglected, to witness what his thoughts have been about his Majesty, and complains that his destiny has ever been 'to be misreported, and condemn'd on the first tale'.

Jonson 3 calls another's virtue to the aid of his own innocence. He understands the cause of his commitment to be his Majesty's displeasure: but while inwardly sorry for it he doubts that he deserves it. He still thinks that he has been misreported and would have the unnamed lord inform his Majesty that he has always been zealously loyal in speech and writing, both public and private.

Jonson 4 says that their offence is a play 'so mistaken, so 'misconstrued, so misapplied, as I do wonder whether their 'Ignorance, or Impudence be most, who are our aduersaries'. He states again that they have been hurried into bondage without any proof of their guilt other than 'malicious Rumor'. The cause of their imprisonment is understood to be the King's displeasure.

Jonson 5, to a 'Most worthy lord' (? D'Aubigny), says that news of his working for their liberty has reached them even in prison, and doubts not that he will work further for their 'vtmost release'.

Jonson 6 tells of his own undesert and 'our offence beinge our misfortune, not our malice'.

Jonson 7 also says that their 'Fortunes' have been made their 'fault' and that they are 'vexed for other mens licence'.

Chapman 3, probably to the Lord Chamberlain, tells of gratitude for hope of speedy delivery and solicits further 'goodness'.

Of the three remaining letters that are more important for our present purpose, Jonson 2, to the Earl of Salisbury, acknowledges that the cause of his and Chapman's imprisonment is a play; but Jonson claims that no man could justly complain of it, for he has always spared particular persons if he has had occasion to touch on any general vice. He suggests that an impartial judge would hold the same view and that 'uncharitable' persons, 'too witty in another mans Workes',¹ sometimes utter their own malicious meanings under his and Chapman's words. He protests that since his first error, still shamefully remembered by him, he has 'attempted' his style: and he beseeches his lordship to

'suffer not othermens Errors, or Falts past, to be made my Crimes; but let Mee be examind, both by all my workes past, and this present, and not to trust to *Rumor*, but my Bookes . . . whether, I haue euer (in anything I haue written priuate, or publique) giuen offence to a Nation, to any publique order or state, or any person of honor, or Authority. . . .'

There is nothing very definite here. 'Bookes' may refer to plays in manuscript as well as in print, just as 'written' may refer to writings that later appeared in print. But there is a strong likelihood that all Jonson's 'workes past' were not in print.

Chapman 1, to the King, contains the very definite statement that the 'chief offences are but two clawses, and both 'of them not our owne: much less the unnaturall issue of our

¹ Cf. the Prologue to Marston's *The Fawn*, quoted later.

'offenceles intents': and that the cause of offence 'may lie subject to construction'.

However much one may like the attractive definiteness of Dr. Parrott's¹ suggestion—that the 'two clawses' referred to are the two sentences of the cancelled passage beginning 'But as', 'And as for my part'—the doubt remains that 'two clawses' may refer to a manuscript version of the play, and may not mean 'two sentences'. Indeed, the editors of the Oxford *Jonson*² seem to take 'clawses' to mean passages: the one, the cancelled passage; and the other, where a 'stolen' knighthood is ridiculed as well as (most probably) the King's dialect and pronunciation.

Chapman 2, to the Lord Chamberlain Suffolk, is the most detailed of the correspondence, and yet it is not entirely unambiguous. Chapman repents no oversight so much 'as that 'our unhappie booke was presented without your Lordshippes 'allowance, for which we can plead nothinge by way of pardon: but your Person so farr removed from our requirde 'attendance; our play so much importun'de, and our cleere 'opinions, that nothing it contain'd could worthely be held 'offensive'. He suggests, moreover, that the Lord Chamberlain would probably have taken their point of view if he had heard their reasons for their 'well wayd Opinions; And the 'wordes truly related on which both they and our enemies 'Complaints were grounded'.

Dr. Greg³ has recently been commenting on this letter, and finds that it puts beyond doubt that the trouble over *Eastward Ho* was due to publication and not to acting. He deals particularly with the two phrases, 'our unhappie booke was presented without your Lordshippes allowance', and 'our play so much importun'de'. He finds it 'inconceivable' that the play was performed without due licence, because that would

¹ *The Comedies of George Chapman*, p. 845.

² Vol. i, p. 191.

³ *Modern Language Review*, January 1928 (vol. xxiii, no. 1), p. 76.

have meant very serious trouble and would have concerned the actors more than the authors ; for it was no part of the business of the authors to see that the actors obtained proper licence. And Dr. Greg, while remembering the technical application of the word ' booke ' and that ' presented ' suggests performance, interprets the first phrase as referring to publication. The second phrase, in his view, points ' unequivocally ' to the demands of the reading public.

It is not easy to understand Dr. Greg's own account of the early stage-history of the play. He believes that the trouble was over publication and yet is aware that the play was licensed for printing. The supposition that the play was printed before production is ruled out by the title-page evidence. The play, then, was produced before printing and was the cause of no commotion at the time. In due course it was apparently sold to publishers who obtained the ordinary licence for printing, still without any stir being made. It was only when copies of the first issue of the first edition were being circulated that exception was taken to one passage that possibly offended Scots and so King James. The offending passage was cancelled and partly replaced, and the authors (some or all) of the play suffered imprisonment.

This account—which I take to be Dr. Greg's—may of course be true ; but I think it involves some straining of the evidence now available and a misreading of Chapman's letter to the Lord Chamberlain.

Dr. Greg uses part of the letter as evidence for his view, and yet later casts a doubt on the value of the letter as evidence at all. He would seem to hold that Chapman, as one of the authors of the play, had no concern with obtaining licence for production ; that he had thus no cause for regret at not having obtained allowance for the play from the Lord Chamberlain ; that, in fact, the letter is the outcome of a petitioner's exaggerated deference and so is untrustworthy as evidence.

But Chapman would hardly seem to be exaggerating deferentially when he wrote of the Lord Chamberlain's 'Person so farr removed from our requirde attendance', and so on. And if it be admitted that the Lord Chamberlain had any concern at all with an 'allowance' for the play, that 'allowance' was most probably the licence for production. It is fairly certain, I think, that neither authors nor actors were concerned with obtaining licence for printing.

I do not think it 'inconceivable' that a play should be produced without due licence. I believe examples of such defiance of authority are to be found. And although with *Eastward Ho* we are hampered by a lack of information about any punishment inflicted on the actors, I believe it safe to assume that trouble over production—whether due to default in obtaining licence, or to careless censorship, or to actors' additions—implicated authors as well as (and perhaps more than) actors. Perhaps the disturbance over *Eastward Ho* may be paralleled in the commotion over the 'mines' play (? by Marston) early in 1608—where King James personally and his projects for the Scotch silver-mine were satirized, evidently at length. The satire was hardly likely to be all or mainly actors' additions, and the play could hardly have been licensed. The King then gave order that the company should be dissolved and that diligent search should be made for the author, who was looked on as the principal offender.¹

And again, a three-author play usually and perhaps always meant that a manager wanted it quickly.² Perhaps the importuning referred to in the phrase, 'our play so much importun'de', came from the manager or managers of the company.

¹ See *M.L.R.*, vol. vi, p. 203 (the dispatch of the French Ambassador, La Boderie); *Mal. Soc. Collections*, vol. ii, pt. 2, pp. 148-9 (the letter of Sir Thomas Lake to Lord Salisbury).

² I am reminded of this in a private communication from Mr. Percy Simpson—but without the present application.

I do not think that sufficient attention has been paid to the phrase, 'And the wordes truly related'. Of course some slight meaning of interpretation may be attached to the word 'related', and so connect it with printed matter. But the key-note of the whole correspondence seems to be a complaint against responsible persons who give ear to and trust rumour, malicious rumour, the licence of other men. The correspondence would seem to show that trouble over *Eastward Ho* arose over production and not over printing.

It is interesting to note that Marston begins the Prologue to his next play, *The Fawn*, produced probably early in 1606:

Let those once know that here with malice lurke,

'Tis base to be too wise, in others worke.

And when that same play could not 'auoide publishing', he asked that its peruser 'be pleased to be my reader, and not my interpreter, since I would faine reserue that office in my owne hands, it being my dayly prayer, Absit à iocorum nostrorum simplicitate malignus interpres (Martial)'.¹

The story of the happenings over *Eastward Ho* may perhaps be as follows. After the success of *Westward Ho*, given by the Children of Paul's, a new play was commissioned for the Children of the Revels from Chapman, Jonson, and Marston, and was much 'importun'de'. Owing to the absence of the Lord Chamberlain, most probably during the progress of the King and his Court to Oxford, from 16 July to 31 August and possibly later, and the authors' opinion that the play was comparatively inoffensive, *Eastward Ho* was produced without

¹ This, without the Prologue, might be taken as evidence for trouble over a printed play. The imperfect ode spoken by the Prologue to *The Malcontent* (produced, probably, 1603-4) begins:

To weast each hurtlesse thought to priuate sence,

Is the foule use of ill bred Impudence:

And when that play was 'inforcively published to be read', he wrote, 'I vnderstand, some have bin most vnadvisedly over-cunning in mis-interpreting me, & with subtilty (as deep as hell) have maliciously spread ill rumors, . . .'

his lordship's 'allowance'.¹ Several passages in the play, perhaps from Marston's pen, made satirically humorous references to the Scots as an intruding nation, to James the First's liberal knightings, his Scotch accent, and so on. During the play's run, Sir James Murray,² one of the King's 'new knights' who was not with the Court on its Oxford progress, took offence at one or more of the references and brought word of the play to the King, probably on his return from Windsor after the Oxford progress, and perhaps during September. We know nothing of what happened to the actors; but the King's displeasure was visited on the authors who (those who could be found) were hurried into bondage. It may be that Marston had warning of the 'delating', or was fortunately out of London at the time, or was imprisoned, but not with Jonson and Chapman or not as long as they. Jonson and Chapman were probably in prison for some few weeks, while the King's anger cooled and until their petitions and friends had worked successfully for their release.

¹ There is perhaps a parallel here with happenings in 1608. The players producing Chapman's *Byron* were prohibited from giving that play; but no sooner had the Court left London than they gave it with even greater offence (see the references *ut supra* for the 'mines' play).

For Suffolk, the Lord Chamberlain's, activities in 1605, see Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, vol. i, esp. pp. 517-18, 536, 555-6. Suffolk troubled Oxford's Vice-Chancellor and the workmen by his dislike of the Christ Church stage. Since he was M.A. of Cambridge, he was incorporated M.A. at Oxford on 30 August, when the others of the Court received degrees (Nichols; and Clark, *Register of Univ. of Oxford*, vol. ii, pt. 1, p. 237).

² Sir James Murray, sixth son of Sir Charles Murray of Cockpool, was knighted at Hampton Court on 5 August 1603. He was not among the courtiers who received degrees at Oxford on 30 August 1605; and the probability is that domestic affairs kept him in London. At the christening of his child on 25 September, he received a gift from the King of 'one cupp and cover of silver guilt' (63 oz.), and early in 1606 a further gift of £100. (For this and other information see Shaw, *Knights of England*, vol. ii, p. 128, and Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, vol. i, pp. 246, 601; vol. ii, p. 44 n. 5.)

Meanwhile the play-book had already gone to the printer, after due licence, perhaps a little before the 'delation'. When the play's offence became known as well as its authors' imprisonment, the type of the first edition was already set up and some few copies had been printed and sold. Questions and inquiries probably caused one chief offending passage to be cancelled in the printed copies and the type of half of the inner and half of the outer forme of one sheet to be reset. Two other editions quickly followed the first, and may have been called for by a *succès de scandale* or by the deserved popularity of the play.

It will be noted that no attempt has been made to give the arguments for and against the concern of the Chapman-Jonson correspondence with *Eastward Ho*, or to discuss the discrepancies between the account of the *Eastward Ho* affair given in Drummond's notes and the account that can be pieced together from the letters.¹

¹ In so far as these matters concern Marston, I hope to deal with them in the edition of Marston that I am preparing.

'EASTWARD HO', 1605

NOTE BY DR. GREG

AFTER carefully considering Mr. Brettle's arguments, which I have been allowed to see in proof, I remain unconvinced.

(1) If Chapman, in maintaining that their 'chief offences are but two clawses', was referring to the play as acted, it is a very strange coincidence that precisely two sentences of the play as first printed were afterwards suppressed. (2) If there had been serious trouble over the performance it is unlikely that the play would have been printed at all; and if nevertheless it was proposed to risk publication we may suppose that the text would have been submitted to rigorous scrutiny alike by the authors and by the reverend gentleman who took the responsibility of licensing it. Of course, if Mr. Brettle's suggestion that the 'delation' was as late as September is correct, the play may have been already in print, and this argument falls to the ground. But in that case the play as first printed presumably agreed with the acting version, and the offence did lie in the passage subsequently suppressed, however notice may have been drawn to it. (3) Trouble arose more than once over the performance of a play that had been duly licensed for the stage: unlicensed performance would have been a more serious offence, and I cannot help thinking that we should have heard more about it if *Eastward Ho* had been a case in point. (4) I do not think Chapman can have been alluding to pressure on the authors when he wrote that the play was 'so much importun'de'. To explain that the authors failed to apply for licence because the manager was in a hurry would have been a singularly lame excuse, and one contrary to the custom of the profession. The obvious defence would have been that they had handed over the manuscript in the ordinary

course, and that, if the manager had omitted to obtain the necessary licence, they could hardly be held responsible for what was in fact no business of theirs. I think, therefore, that the phrase 'so much importun'de' can only refer to the demand of the reading public. (5) Still more extraordinary would have been the excuse that they had neglected to submit the play to the Master of the Revels, whose business it was to grant or refuse the licence, because the Lord Chamberlain himself was absent on progress! I believe the play was licensed for the stage just as it was licensed for the press, but that nevertheless trouble arose over one or other of these forms of publication. Chapman then sought to deprecate official displeasure by suggesting that, not content with the ordinary licence, he would have sought the personal approval of the Lord Chamberlain had the latter not been 'so farr removed from our required attendance'. It was just a bit of blarney.

I admit the force of Mr. Brettles argument respecting 'the words truly related', no less than that of the phrase 'our unhappie booke was presented', but I do not think that it can outweigh the other considerations. Perhaps no certain conclusion is possible on the evidence before us, but to me at least it seems that the balance of probability is in favour of printing rather than performance having been the ground of offence.

FURTHER NOTES ON SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS

By J. A. FORT



OUR years ago, in a thin pamphlet printed by the Clarendon Press and entitled *The Two Dated Sonnets of Shakespeare*, I argued that, if the sonnets of the first series or the Fair Youth sonnets (i-cxxvi) are read through in the order in which they were originally printed and the Fair Youth is identified with the third Earl of Southampton, the 104th sonnet must have been written in April (or thereabout) 1596 and the 107th in November 1598: then that, if this is correct, the first 106 sonnets were composed between April 1593 and April 1596, that *A Lover's Complaint* was sent to Southampton during his long liaison with Lady Elizabeth Vernon, probably in the last half of 1596 or the first half of 1597, that Shakespeare resumed his interrupted correspondence with the Earl when the latter was released from the imprisonment which followed his marriage with Lady Elizabeth—for Queen Elizabeth never forgave him for his marriage and the imprisonment might well have been a long one—that cviii-cxxvi represent an attempt and a failure on Shakespeare's part to renew his old intimacy with his patron, and that he finally ceased to send sonnets to the latter when the Essex conspiracy was being plotted or prepared, i. e. in November or December 1600. I have now been invited by the editor of *The Library*, who approved of some of my suggestions when they first appeared,¹ to give some account of the work that I have done in connexion with these poems since 1924, and I hope that my conclusions may have some interest for readers of *The*

¹ See *The Library* for March 1925 (vol. v, p. 375).—Ed.

Library, though they represent, I fear, only a slight advance beyond those that I have published already.

In the first place, then, four years ago I continued my work by re-examining the two hypotheses upon which my argument is founded, and I will deal first with Thorpe's arrangement of the poems. The obvious and perhaps the chief reason for believing that Thorpe printed the sonnets substantially in their true or original order is that in those groups of them which describe some definite incident, i. e. especially the Stolen Mistress sonnets (xxxiii-xlii), the Dark Mistress sonnets (cxxvii-clii with four omissions) which deal, I now think, with exactly the same events as xxxiii-xlii, and the Rival Poet sonnets (lxxviii-lxxxvii), the poems seem to stand in their true chronological order; but I find a second reason for my belief in the excellent text and the large amount of unpublished poetry by Shakespeare which Thorpe managed to secure in 1609. Thus I find that the editors of the *Cambridge Shakespeare* have amended Thorpe's text in seventy-seven words; and, if one error in every two sonnets seems at first to imply that Thorpe printed from a defective manuscript, an analysis of the blunders corrected in the Cambridge text shows that nearly all of them arose either while Thorpe's book was being set up in type or while his agent was copying the manuscript from which his text was ultimately derived. If I estimate rightly, the blunders arose in the following ways: forty-one from a compositor's having either placed an incorrect letter or a letter incorrectly in the chase, e. g. 'felfe' for 'felte' in lxiii. 11, or 'wit' and 'wiht' for 'with' and 'wit' in xxiii. 14; three were wholly false words, which may or may not represent the compositor's blundering, namely 'or' for 'all' in xii. 4, 'worth' for 'fight' in xxv. 9, and 'loss' for 'cross' in xxxiv. 12; fifteen were the error 'their' for 'thy', which is repeated fifteen times, and is usually thought to have arisen from the use of some abbreviation in the copying of the manuscript

secured; fifteen arose from further misreading or misunderstanding either of the author's or the copyist's manuscript, the most notable examples being 'steeld' for 'stelled' in xxiv. 1, 'guilst' for 'gildeſt' in xxviii. 12, 'as' for 'or' in lvi. 13, 'end' for 'due' in lxix. 3, 'rn'wd' for 'ruined' in lxxiii. 4, 'lack' for 'latch' in cxiii. 6, and 'proud' for 'prov'd' in cxxix. 11; while close together at the end of the second series of sonnets there occur three mistakes, which seem clearly to have arisen while a clerk was transcribing from dictation—these are 'ſight' for 'ſide' in cxliv. 6, the well-known *crux* in cxlvi. 2, and 'eye' for 'I' in clii. 13.

If this is even an approximately accurate analysis of the errors in Thorpe's text nearly, if not quite, all the errors which modern editors note in these sonnets arose either while the latter were being set up in type or while the manuscript copy of them, which Thorpe's agent secured, was being copied for the printer; and, if that is so, the manuscript copy, from which Thorpe's text was ultimately derived, must have been almost entirely free from mistakes. As for the source from which Thorpe obtained these poems, a very remarkable story of some kind must lie behind his Dedication, for not only had Shakespeare's poems been dispatched in the first instance to at least three different persons, but four of the sonnets of the second series (cxxix and cxlvi with cxxxviii and cxliv) are, evidently, not letters addressed to the Dark Lady and are indeed of such a kind that it is hardly possible that they were ever shown to her. It is therefore difficult, quite apart from the question whether the Fair Youth can ever have given up such a sonnet as xx, or the Dark Lady such a sonnet as cxxxvii, for publication, to think of any one who can possibly have assembled and supplied to Thorpe's agent all the poems that were printed in 1609, except the author himself; and, surprising as that thought is, it must be considered a possibility that Thorpe obtained his material nearly directly from Shakespeare. It is

conceivable that the latter connived at the publication of his poems, but two trained clerks relieving each other could have copied all that Thorpe's book contained in about two days, and I think it more probable that his agent had access to a copy of the poems lent to some one for perusal only.

As for the authenticity of Thorpe's material, the large number of passages in early sonnets resembling passages in early plays, which, if my time-scheme for these poems is at all correct, were written before any of those plays had been printed, satisfies me that those sonnets were composed by a member of the Lord Chamberlain's Company, and, if that is so, they can hardly have been composed by any one but Shakespeare himself. I think it improper to reject any sonnets solely on the ground that they are inferior to others in quality, and I hold strongly that in any case the fine 8th sonnet and the commonplace 128th, which begin respectively 'Music to hear (i. e. Thou, whose voice is music), why hear'st thou music sadly?' and 'How oft when thou, my music, music play'st', were composed by the same poet. I may add that I abjure the speculation about the Dark Lady sonnets which I printed in 1924, and now hold, as most people do, that they were written at the same time as the Stolen Mistress sonnets.

Cxxvii, cxxviii, and cxxx-cxxxii, were written, I think, while the Dark Lady still favoured Shakespeare, and xxxiii and xxxiv were sent to Southampton when cxxxiii and cxxxiv were sent to the poet's mistress, while cxxxv-clii, except cxxxviii, cxliv, and cxlvi, represent an attempt and a failure of the poet to win back his mistress after all. I attribute to the phrase 'thou hast thy *Will*' in cxxxv. 1 the same meaning that it has in cxliii. 13, and the words in this last passage clearly mean the same as 'catch thy hope' in line 11, i. e. they do not mean 'secure your William' but 'catch what you are pursuing': there is no need therefore after all to give the name 'William' to Shakespeare's friend. If it is remembered that

Shakespeare's connexion with the lady was adultery (clii. 3), that in June and July 1594 he was deeply indebted to Southampton and was, if Mr. J. Q. Adams is correct (*A Life of William Shakespeare*, p. 190), negotiating for a place in the Lord Chamberlain's Company which was then being reorganized, while he was uncertain, even when he wrote cxliv (see lines 13 and 14), whether the Dark Lady had or had not become Southampton's mistress, it should not, I think, surprise us that the incident did not put an end to his close intercourse with his patron.

With regard to the identity of the Fair Youth, though the search for him has extended over a wide area, yet, if we take account only of those theories which are based upon some reliable evidence, we shall find that the Fair Youth's hiding-place is really quite a narrow plot of ground. Thus, as sixteenth-century poets often addressed their patrons in language which is indistinguishable from the language¹ of love, and in all of these sonnets, in which the sex of the person addressed is fixed by some grammatical term, the person addressed is a man, the suggestion that some of these poems were addressed to a woman is not, I submit, tenable; while again, the fact that in the Stolen Mistress and the Dark Lady sonnets (xxxiii-xlii and cxxvii-clii) Shakespeare described the same incidents in contemporaneous letters to two different persons makes it, I think, impossible that those incidents should have been fictitious ones. So the Fair Youth must anyhow have been a real youth, while he was also some one with whom the poet was closely associated for at least three years (civ), to whom he sent 126 highly polished poems, though he knew that they would be preserved in manuscript only (xvii. 9), who was always treated by the poet with the greatest deference, and who was courted by several other writers besides Shakespeare (lxxviii. 1-4 and lxxxii. 3, 4, and 7). And then that group of

¹ Sir Sidney Lee's *A Life of William Shakespeare*, pp. 205 sq.

Fair Youth sonnets, in which Shakespeare expostulates with his friend so persistently for showing favour to a second poet (lxxviii-lxxxvii), limits, it seems to me, the field of our inquiry very closely indeed. For, if one man may have two best friends, another clearly may have two chief poets; so that, when Shakespeare claims to be treated as some one's only Court-poet, he really claims, too, that he has always treated that person as the dearest of his friends: the remonstrances in these sonnets therefore necessarily imply that the friend addressed in them is the same as the youth addressed in the preceding sonnets, and they seem to imply even more than that. For in the Dedication to *Lucrece* Shakespeare wrote to Southampton, 'what I have done is yours, what I have to do is yours, being part in all I have, devoted yours'; and he not only wrote these words to be printed in 1594 but suffered them to be printed again in 1598,¹ by a printer who would probably have listened to any objection he might have made. Not only therefore must the friend addressed in the first 87 sonnets have been a single individual, but he can hardly, so far as I can see, have been any one else than Southampton himself, unless those sonnets were all written after the year 1598.

The crucial problem therefore connected with the Fair Youth sonnets (i-cxxvi) is to determine, as nearly as that can be done, the date at which those poems were composed; and hidden fires smoulder beneath the feet of any one who attempts to do so.

It is hardly possible, it may be said at once, that Shakespeare composed any sonnets in the year 1591, for it was the publication of Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*, with 28 sonnets by Daniel, in that year, which first revealed to Elizabethan poets and readers the nature and possibilities of the sonnet as

¹ Mr. H. M. Adams has kindly examined the copy of the 1598 edition of *Lucrece*, which is in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, and finds the original Dedication repeated in it with changes of spelling only.

a form of verse, and it is less likely that Shakespeare began writing sonnets in 1592 than that he did so in 1593; for in the first of these two years only Daniel and Constable, both of whom had evidently seen Sidney's poems in manuscript, published verse of this sort, while in 1593 no less than four of Shakespeare's contemporaries published sequences of sonnets (Lee, *Life*, p. 709), and it was really in that year that the cult of the sonnet, which rose to such an extraordinary height in the next few years, commenced in earnest. That Shakespeare, however, did write some 14-line poems in the course of the year 1593 seems highly probable, for two such poems, one at least of which seems to have stood in the play from the beginning, appear in *Romeo and Juliet*, and several, some of which seem necessary to the action of the play, appear in *Love's Labour's Lost*; while the phrase 'my pupil pen', which occurs in the sixteenth sonnet, must surely have been written at the latest before the end of the year 1594. I believe therefore that I am on firm ground when I assign the first seventeen sonnets, which form a single group of letters, either to 1593 or at latest the following year.

When, however, we try to determine the dates of the other poems addressed to the Fair Youth (xviii-cxxvi) dangers gather round us; for until we can identify Shakespeare's friend we have, so far as I know, only one method available for our purpose, and in practice that method produces both less clear and less certain results than we might reasonably have expected; if, however, it enables us to obtain any information at all, it may still be sufficient for my purpose, for I am only anxious, I would remind my readers, to show that a considerable number of these sonnets were composed before the republication of *Lucrece* in 1598.

In the *Shakespeares Jahrbuch* for 1884 Hermann Isaac suggested that, if different works by the same author are examined and the passages in them in which similarities of thought or

expression occur—he himself called such passages ‘parallelisms’—are duly noted, it will be found that parallelisms occur most frequently in works which are near to each other in point of time. Many of Isaac’s own conclusions cannot be accepted to-day, and several precautions have to be taken in applying the principle which he enunciated; but in itself the principle seems a sound one, and Dr. R. M. Alden, in his comprehensive work on Shakespeare’s sonnets,¹ has set out the number of the parallelisms that Isaac noted in Shakespeare’s different works, together with those that an American scholar, Mr. Horace Davis, found in the same works, in a very convenient table, which well repays detailed study but of which I can here only give the substance.

Much caution, however, as I have said, has to be exercised in using the figures in this table, for when the parallelisms are examined it is at once clear that they only approximately resemble each other; they are not alike as the beads of a necklace are alike, but only as the pebbles that lie together on a beach are like each other. Thus parallelisms differ from each other both in degree of similarity and in significance; those that are echoes from plays into sonnets are clearly far more numerous than those that are echoes from sonnets into plays; and clearly echoes from plays might enter the text of sonnets not only when those plays were being composed but at any time when those plays were still being acted; so the interval between an original phrase and its echo varied greatly in different cases, while, as soon as Shakespeare had written (say) half a dozen plays, what I may call ‘indirect echoes’ arose, i. e. a phrase sometimes passed not only into a single sonnet but also into other plays, so that a parallelism may appear in a play with which the sonnet, that seems to be connected with it, has really no connexion whatever. Yet when all is said and done, a great deal of information can be extracted from the

¹ Published by the Houghton Mifflin Company of Boston and New York.

parallelisms noted in Shakespeare's different works; for a little consideration shows that, though those found in the later plays are very complicated phenomena, those found in the earlier ones are very simple, since nearly all of the latter are direct echoes from plays into sonnets and in most of them the parallel phrases are unmistakably connected with each other; the facts indeed fully justify Mr. J. Q. Adams's statement of the case: 'I have collected most of these parallels. The way in which they become increasingly rarer and less significant as the plays advance in date is very impressive' (*A Life of William Shakespeare*, p. 163). It may anyhow, I think, fairly be estimated in any calculation that, though occasionally the interval between an original phrase and its echo may have been a very long period of time, yet almost always a phrase that passed from a play into a sonnet did so within (say) two years of the day on which the play was performed for the first time.

Thus, though many of the calculations that we should like to make in connexion with Dr. Alden's table cannot properly be made, the one numerical calculation that I propose to make myself seems to me not only a legitimate but a safe one; if, that is to say, leaving the two narrative poems altogether out of the account for the present, we contrast the number of parallelisms found in the fourteen plays which are usually considered to be Shakespeare's earliest plays with the number found in the twenty-two plays that he wrote afterwards, such matters as the varying nature of the subject-matter in the different plays, the variations in the intervals between original phrases and their echoes in different cases, and whether the sonnet-phrase or the play-phrase was the original in different parallelisms may safely be disregarded; for in a block of fourteen or a block of twenty-two plays such irregularizing influences as these must counterbalance each other almost, if not quite, completely.

According to Isaac's calculation, then, the first fourteen

plays contain between them 281 parallelisms and the last twenty-two only 208, i. e. the earlier plays contain on an average twice as many parallelisms as the later ones; while according to Davis's calculation the first fourteen plays contain between them 364 parallelisms and the last twenty-two only 186, i. e. the earlier plays contain on an average three times as many parallelisms as the later ones. The contrast between the higher and the lower figures in each of these estimates is so remarkable that, even if we adopt the first—and, so far as I can judge, the less accurate—of the two estimates, and whatever allowance we make for possible errors in it, we are still, I think, forced to the conclusion that Shakespeare composed sonnets in one period of his career more actively or frequently than he did at any other time, and that he did so in a period in which he also composed his first fourteen plays or in which he was acting in those plays from time to time. Isaac's and Davis's figures, then, though they do not, I think, enable us to determine whether this period began in 1592 or in 1593, yet show that it included the years 1594 and 1595, and suggest that it ended at or about the end of the year 1596: it must anyhow have ended before the critical year 1598. The evidence that can be found in *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece* seems to point, too, in the same direction, for, though some of the many parallelisms found in these poems may possibly be echoes from them that entered the text of the sonnets after 1596, most of those parallelisms must be echoes that entered the text of the sonnets when first one and then the other of the two poems was either being composed or was still a recent composition, i. e. in 1593, 1594, or 1595. I add to this that the 102nd sonnet states clearly that there was in fact a period in which the poet wrote sonnets with special frequency, placing it near the beginning of his intimacy with the Fair Youth, and that no commentator, so far as I can discover, has ever tried to date these poems from the parallel passages found in them without

attributing the majority of them to some part of the period 1594 to 1598.

Briefly stated, then, my argument for the identification of the Fair Youth with Southampton is that first the existence of the two groups of letters, xxxiii-xlii and cxxvii-clii (with four omissions), shows that the Fair Youth was not an imaginary person; secondly, the existence of the 'Rival Poet' sonnets, lxxviii-lxxxvii, shows that there were not ever two Fair Youths, while there is no evidence at all that any of the first 126 sonnets were addressed to a lady; thirdly, the years to which we must assign most of these sonnets show that the Fair Youth was not Lord William Herbert, for he was only fourteen years of age in 1594, and then, if we bring together the facts that Shakespeare printed the Dedication to *Lucrece* both in 1594 and 1598 and that between those two years he not only wrote the 'Rival Poet' sonnets but addressed his friend in nearly every poem with the warmest affection, there is really no alternative to the theory which identifies the Fair Youth with the third Earl of Southampton.

My readers will see, then, that I have found some sort of an answer to several questions which have hitherto received but little attention, and I have, I think, established the following propositions somewhat more firmly than I had established them before. First, though the purpose and origin of sonnets cxxix and cxlvi, cxxxviii and cxliv, have not been explained, Thorpe's arrangement of the sonnets seems to be substantially correct and his text to have been printed from a very good copy of them; secondly, though we shall never know for certain how much Southampton wronged Shakespeare in the summer of 1594, we are, alas, certain that the poet had wronged his mistress's husband a good deal more; thirdly, though the parallel passages observed in Shakespeare's different works do not enable us to date particular sonnets with exactitude, they enable us to determine within about two

years the period in which the majority of the sonnets were composed ; and lastly, the Fair Youth was almost certainly Southampton.

The crucial test of the Southampton theory must of course always be the extent to which it is consistent with and throws light upon the whole text of the sonnets. I can only say that I have examined the whole of that text and annotated the whole of it for my own use without finding a phrase in it which is not entirely consistent with that theory.

This last claim, however, raises the difficult question of Thorpe's well-known Dedication :

TO . THE . ONLIE . BEGETTER . OF .
THESE . INSVING . SONNETS .
MR . W . H . ALL . HAPPINESSE .
AND . THAT . ETERNITIE .
PROMISED .

BY .

OVR . EVER-LIVING . POET .

WISHETH .

THE . WELL-WISHING .

ADVENTVRER . IN .

SETTING .

FORTH .

T . T .

and I offer the following interpretation of this paragraph. 'Begetter' is so rare a word that the *O.E.D.* quotes only two other passages besides this one in which, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the word was used in any but its literal sense ; and those two passages, 'the onely one God the

Begetter of the soules of other gods' (Golding, 1587) and 'the word of God . . . is the begetter of faith' (Bastwick, 1637), do not throw any light upon the meaning of the word in this passage; so its meaning here can only be determined from the context, and as 'to beget' meant in Shakespeare's day not only 'to procreate' in a literal or a metaphorical sense but also, as it does in *Hamlet*, III. ii. 28, 'to get or obtain', 'pro-creator, causer, author, inspirer', obtainer, and, I would add, 'bringer-to-life' are all, I submit, equally legitimate interpretations of the word in this passage.

If that is the case, however, a strange result follows, for the passage can be read in two quite different but self-consistent ways, i. e. it may either be read: 'Thomas Thorpe, the well-intentioned publisher (or the publisher who is hopeful of success), wishes to the only inspirer of the following sonnets, Mr. W. H., all happiness and the eternal fame promised to the Fair Youth in the last two lines of the eighteenth and nineteenth sonnets'; or it may be read: 'Thomas Thorpe, the etc. publisher, wishes to the only obtainer (or, as I prefer, 'bringer-to-life') of the following sonnets, Mr. W. H., all happiness (i. e., almost certainly, as Sir Sidney Lee interprets 'it, Mr. W. Hall' happiness) and that eternity which is promised in the last two lines of the sixteenth and seventeenth sonnets to any one who begets a son'—for, as Colonel Ward has discovered,¹ a William Hall was married in Hackney Church on 4 August 1608. And I suggest that both these readings of the passage are correct: I believe, in fact, that Thorpe purposely devised a series of phrases which could bear more than one interpretation, hoping that most of his customers would interpret them in one way and think that he had

¹ William Hall was a bookseller's assistant who was very successful in obtaining unpublished manuscript for publication.

² See *The Mystery of Mr. W. H.*, by Col. B. R. Ward, published by Cecil Palmer.

obtained his material from the Fair Youth himself, while he knew that his own friends would interpret them in the other way, which is in fact the true story of the obtaining of these poems: he thus suggested an untruth without saying anything that was actually untrue, while he also told the true story of his publication without disclosing it.

There are still three points that I must mention: first, that the jest which Thorpe made to William Hall kept better company in the seventeenth century than it does to-day, for Shakespeare puts a similar wish into the mouth of Gratiano in *The Merchant of Venice*, III. ii. 216, and into that of Ceres in *The Tempest*, IV. i. 114 and 115; and secondly, that the writing of a Dedication which would be intelligible to the few though obscure to the many was not anyhow a device that was invented by Thorpe, for James Roberts prefixed a Dedication of that kind—it may be found in Sir Sidney Lee's *Elizabethan Sonnets*, and began 'Obscured wonders, Gentlemen, visited me in Turnus's armour'—to the 1594 edition of Constable's *Diana*; lastly I must, I fear, argue that this paragraph cannot ever directly reveal the identity of the Fair Youth.

The rest of my work since 1924 has been simply the 'applying', in the Euclidean sense of the word, of the text of the Fair Youth sonnets to the incidents of Southampton's life, and it will probably be most convenient to my readers if I tell the story that I find in them year by year. Shakespeare, according to my time-scheme, wrote his first sonnet to Southampton soon after he had finished *Venus and Adonis*, when the Earl was 19½ years old and usually resided in London, and he wrote the first seventeen sonnets when the latter was under a contract to marry Lady Elizabeth Vere, while he abandoned the subject of marriage about the time when Southampton for the second time refused to marry that lady; I believe that the twenty-sixth sonnet was sent with a presentation-copy of the poem *Lucrece*, and that the 'Absence sonnets' xxvii and

xxviii, which I could not date in 1924, were written about 16 May 1594, when the Lord Chamberlain's Company visited Winchester (J. Tucker Murray's *English Dramatic Companies*, vol. i, p. 82). The incidents of the 'Stolen Mistress' then took place in the summer of 1594, which was a specially critical period in Shakespeare's life, for even the leading companies of actors had been in great difficulties during the two years (June 1592 to May 1594 with two very short intervals) during which the London theatres had been closed; and in the reorganization of the Lord Chamberlain's Company, which apparently took place in this summer, Shakespeare obtained a prominent position. I connect the 'Absence sonnets' xliii-lii with a visit that that company paid to Marlborough about 19 September 1594 (J. Tucker Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 108), and I think that lv was very possibly written to be presented to Southampton on the day on which he came of age, 6 October 1594. Though I do not wish to lay undue stress on particular parallel passages, it is noticeable that all the thoughts expressed in *Venus and Adonis*, lines 157-74 and 751-66, reappear with but little variation in the first seventeen sonnets, and that cxxviii is simply a paraphrase of *Love's Labour's Lost*, iv. iii. 250-3 and 258-65.

The story proceeds clearly enough from this point. Southampton, when he returned to London from Titchfield in Hampshire after 6 October 1594, must have been an exceedingly busy man, for he not only had to take over the management of a large landed estate, but he had to make a settlement on his mother, who was about to remarry; he laboured hard for some time to obtain a pardon for his friends, Sir Charles and Sir Henry Danvers, who had between them killed a man in a duel; and he had great difficulty in obtaining a release from his own contract to marry Lady Elizabeth Vere. It is not surprising, therefore, that, as lvi-lviii show, Shakespeare was at first seldom able to find him disengaged, but the poet

was evidently very soon even more intimate with the Earl than he had been before—he wrote to him, till the episode of the 'Rival Poet' began, i.e. in lix–lxxvii, on every variety of topic, he even ventured to remonstrate with him more than once on his behaviour, and sonnet after sonnet in this part of Thorpe's book is splendid poetry. It is only the story of an older man of inferior rank, who already foresaw (xlix) that his influence over a younger man of higher rank must some day cease, trying to retain his influence as long as possible; and, in order to do so, Shakespeare had always to send letters of compliment or affection immediately after his letters of reproof; but the poet handled his difficult pupil with consummate skill, and it is a most fascinating story. Nos. lxvii and lxviii especially, which were written at a time when the fashion of wearing false hair—it was worn by persons of both sexes—reached, according to Mr. Planché (*Encyclopaedia of Costume*, 'Perruke'), an extravagant height, and which warn Southampton that his friends were bringing him into ridicule by wearing false hair to imitate his real but long curls and by rouging their faces to emulate his fair complexion (lxvii. 8), are a delightful piece of old letter-writing. So, too, in spite of its flattery, is lxx, in which Shakespeare congratulates Southampton on having escaped from Lady Elizabeth Vere and on not having been entangled in any other undesirable marriage; and so, too, are xciv and xcv, in which the quibbling logic veils a serious appeal to Southampton to be true to his best self. As for the Rival Poet, I think that he was probably Chapman but that the evidence on the subject is not conclusive, and I fear that a knowledge of his name would not help us at all in our search for the Fair Youth. I connect xcvii, xcvi, and xcix, the last of which is a continuation of xcvi, with the provincial tour of the Lord Chamberlain's Company in the summer of 1595; and c–ciii indicate quite clearly a definite break in the intercourse of the two friends. As it was at the end of September 1595 that Sir

Rowland Whyte first noticed Southampton's infatuation for Essex's cousin, Lady Elizabeth Vernon, I set that down as the cause of the separation of the two friends, and I believe that the separation was in fact a long one. As then I think that cv and cvi followed civ very closely, I hold that the first 106 of the Fair Youth sonnets, as well as all the Dark Lady sonnets, were written in three particular years in which Southampton was frequently in London and as yet free from serious responsibilities, while Shakespeare was still making his way in the world, and the vogue of the sonnet was still at its height; at the same time the number of poems that Thorpe assigns to each of the various periods that I have mentioned seems to me, in view of the phrase in cii. 5 seq., about the number that we should expect to find in each case.

As for the rest of these sonnets, I still hold that Shakespeare ceased to write to Southampton from the spring of 1596 to November 1598; and, given the circumstances of the latter's life in those years, we ought not to be surprised that that was the case, for the Earl was either preparing for or engaged in an expedition that Essex led to Spain and the Azores, through the whole of the summer of 1597, and he was in France from February to November 1598. Through all the three years, 1596-8, his liaison with Lady Elizabeth Vernon continued in some form or other, while Queen Elizabeth steadily refused to allow their marriage and Southampton apparently hesitated between his ambition and his love. I have already suggested, as the Comtesse de Chambrun first suggested, that *A Lover's Complaint* was sent to the Earl in lieu of sonnets in one of these years, and then in August 1598 Southampton, learning that Lady Elizabeth was expecting a child, disobeyed both the Queen and Sir Robert Cecil, under whom he was serving in France, and returned secretly to England to marry his lady-love. He was imprisoned by the Queen in the Fleet prison for doing so in November 1598; and, though he was released

in two or three weeks, he was in fact in very great danger, and the Queen never forgave him for what he had done.

As, then, I still trust Thorpe's arrangement of the sonnets, and cannot interpret cvii as a poem of affection only, I hold that its first stanza refers to Southampton's release from prison in November 1598, and its second stanza to the Earl's final preference of Lady Elizabeth to Queen Elizabeth and the ending of his long wooing in a happy marriage.

Lack of space prevents my pointing out the details which show that the last twenty sonnets are considerably later in date than the first 106, but if a reader will simply omit what I may call the 'poems of affection' in this group of sonnets, he will, I think, realize that, though time stands still for Shakespeare in cviii, cxii, and cxvi, Southampton still being to him in these poems the Fair Youth of the 104th and indeed of the 26th sonnet, there are marked differences between the rest of these later sonnets, as I will venture to call them, and the earlier ones: the linguistic and dialectic artifices of the earlier poems are nearly absent from the later ones; and the thought is weightier, the imagery more impressive, in these last twenty sonnets, while Shakespeare does not use the phrase 'love' or 'true-love' at all after the 107th sonnet, and on the other hand does use 'you' for the first time in most unyielding remonstrances. The 'I never writ' of cxvi. 14 is very different from the 'my pupil pen' of xvi. 10; the poet's attitude towards his dramatic work is very different in cx. 3 from what it was in c. 4; and every passage in these last sonnets which refers to the friendship of the two men implies that that friendship was then of very long standing. The phrases 'sweet boy' in cviii. 5 and 'my lovely boy' in cxvi. 1 have been considered obstacles to this view, but James I applied the first phrase to Prince Charles and Buckingham when they were respectively twenty-two and thirty years old; Greene, if the passage has been interpreted rightly, applied it to Nashe when

the latter was twenty-five years old; and in 2 *Henry IV*, v. iv. 45, Shakespeare himself makes Falstaff greet Henry V as 'my sweet boy' when the latter was not only twenty-six years old but also a king.

Southampton was in Ireland with Essex from April to September 1599, and when he returned with the latter from that disastrous enterprise he did not, so Sir Rowland Whyte again wrote, go to Court at all, but passed his time 'merely in going to plaies every day': some of these sonnets therefore must have been written in the autumn of 1599; a few of them represent an attempt and a failure of Shakespeare to resume the old relations with his patron, more of them are a heated defence of the poet to certain charges that Southampton had brought against him. I do not see how cxvi can have been addressed to any one except Southampton himself, and the same is, I think, true of cxxiv, the first stanza of which has often puzzled editors but seems to have a very definite meaning. In cxvi. 1 and 2, 'Let me not to the marriage of true minds Admit impediments', the poet represents his affection as the offspring of a marriage of two minds, that of Southampton by which it was begotten and his own in which it was conceived; he takes up that thought here and declares that his affection was therefore bound to Southampton by a bond, which nothing could ever dissolve; had his affection, however, been 'the child of state', i. e. of Splendour, it would, he says, have been a bastard child only, since Fortune cannot make a true marriage with a mind, and in that case his affection might have been dissociated from Southampton ('unfather'd'). The next two lines, then, mean 'in this case only could my 'love have been subject to time and circumstance, resembling 'now a bunch of weeds gathered (i. e. pulled up) from among 'other weeds, now a bouquet of flowers gathered (i. e. picked and kept in a bouquet) with other flowers'.

In cxxiv. 8 I read 'inditing', i. e. 'indicting or accusing',

for 'inviting', and believe that the passage refers to an Order which the Privy Council issued on 22 June 1600, in consequence of complaints made by the City Authorities (Lee's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 339, and A. W. Pollard's *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates*, p. 42), closing all London theatres except two, and limiting the performances in those two to two a week. In cxxv. 4 I restore Thorpe's reading 'proves' and understand by 'eternity' 'eternal fame': an approximate date, then, emerges from this poem too, for Southampton's period of splendour had lasted only from April 1593 to April (or thereabout) 1596, while the period in which he was first out of favour with the Queen and then in disgrace had in the autumn of 1600 lasted already more than three years. I regard this sonnet, in which the poet sums up the whole of his intercourse with his patron, and proudly declares that not all the benefits were on his side in the early years of their association, as a formal ending of the long correspondence, and I look upon the last slight poem, which is full of echoes from sonnets composed before 1596, as a friendly letter of warning written when Southampton was being drawn into the Essex conspiracy.

It will be seen that all the chief vicissitudes of Southampton's life seem to be reflected in Shakespeare's verses, and some at least of those reflections must, I think, be true images of the events that I have described. I am most grateful to the editor of *The Library* for giving me this opportunity of telling this old and interesting story once again.

POSTSCRIPT.—In a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* of 29 November, kindly communicated to me before publication, Mr. G. B. Harrison makes the interesting suggestion that sonnet cvii should be assigned to October 1596 rather than to November 1598, the references in lines 5 to 8 being to the Queen's having safely emerged on 6 September 1596 from her 'climacteric year' (during which she had been so seriously

ill as to arouse expectations and prophecies of her death), and to the renewal of her league with Henri IV on 29 August 1596.

This explanation of the sonnet is a very attractive one, so far as lines 5 to 8 are concerned, and it is quite possible that my time-scheme for the sonnets should be amended so as to harmonize with it, for the phrases by which I have dated the last three sonnets may well have been written in 1599, and would have been approximately correct even in 1598; but I think it right to suspend judgement about Mr. Harrison's theory till he has given also his full explanation of the first four lines of the sonnet. Granted that Southampton may well have been in danger of imprisonment in the autumn of 1596, since (Stopes, p. 97) he probably attempted to join that year in Essex's expedition against Cadiz without having obtained the Queen's permission to do so, I still find it difficult to understand how the renewal of the league with Henri IV could have improved the Earl's position at that time.

CAXTON'S SON-IN-LAW

No doubt Mr. W. J. Blyth Crotch has reprinted the article by my brother and myself in *Notes & Queries*, 10 s., vi, p. 241, for the sake of making a continuous narrative. (See *The Library*, ix, June 1928, p. 48.)

I have always been interested in William Caxton, and, working in my hobby-horsical time at the Record Office and elsewhere, further Caxton discoveries have come my way, as yet unpublished.

The particular facts about Gerard Crop are not new. The late Mr. E. Gordon Duff had a fresh transcript made of the document we printed, and it is printed in *The Library*, Second Series, viii. (October 1907) 408, with the original spelling retained. Reference to that article (p. 414) will demonstrate that the word my brother and I query as 'declared' is put by Mr. Duff's transcriber as 'answered', which is much more likely to be correct.

This fact about Caxton will also be found recorded in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, a final paragraph with the reference to *Notes & Queries* being added to the stereotype article.

FRANK MARCHAM.

I have to offer my sincere apologies to Mr. F. Marcham for what seems to him to be a cold-blooded plagiarism. This impression is enhanced by the fact that my reference figure (vol. ix, June 1928, p. 48, first note) is misplaced and should appear after the word 'nuncupative'. It was to Mr. Marcham and his brother that I was indebted for the idea of Caxton's will being nuncupative, and it was unpardonable of me not to mention their names in addition to my note of reference as to the exact source. The sentence explaining nuncupative testaments is my own. I should like to add that I worked very carefully through the records of the Early Chancery Proceedings at the Public Records Office and had met with and transcribed the document in question before I came across their letter to *Notes and Queries*, which gave the document only in a modernized spelling. Whether or not I owe to them the obscure word 'declared' I cannot now positively remember (it is a word which easily suggests itself): had I known of Mr. Gordon Duff's 'answered' I should have acknowledged and embraced it. I trust that it will be realized from a perusal of my previous papers that I have never intentionally concealed my sources.

May I take this opportunity of expressing, in addition to my apologies and the assurance that my indebtedness shall be made clear in the volume for the E.E.T.S. which is about to be published, the eager hope that the further Caxton discoveries Mr. Frank Marcham refers to may be no longer withheld from us?

W. J. BLYTH CROTCH.

Mr. Gordon Duff's reprint of the document escaped the editorial memory and Mr. Crotch's notice from having formed part of an article with the general title *Early Chancery Proceedings concerning the Book Trade*. Mr. Marcham's phrase 'for the sake of making a continuous narrative' closely corresponds to that of Mr. Crotch in offering the article to 'round off the new Caxton matter', i.e. what has been discovered since Blades. I am quite sure that in offering the article Mr. Crotch was unaware that his reference to Messrs. Marcham's article in *Notes and Queries* did not show the fact that the text had been printed there, though in modern spelling. I hope that Mr. Frank Marcham will agree that the phrase 'reprinted the article' in his opening sentence should not have been used.

A. W. P.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The Oldest London Bookshop, a history of two hundred years. By GEORGE SMITH and FRANK BENDER. To which is appended a family correspondence of the Eighteenth century. London, Ellis, 29 New Bond Street. 1928, pp. viii. 141.

MESSRS. ELLIS have spared neither for trouble nor expense in making this volume by two of the present members of the firm a worthy memorial of the completion of the second century of the existence of their house as a notable London bookshop. The word 'house' seems the most appropriate to use, since the ownership of the business there, although some real continuity has been preserved, has never descended from father to son, so that with almost every death new names have come into it, until affection for the memory of Mr. F. S. Ellis and his nephew caused the present partners to use their surname as a permanent title for the firm. The house was a new one in 1728, for though Old Bond Street, built on the Clarendon estate in 1686 by Sir Thomas Bond, had been extended early in the eighteenth century, the new section was only completed by about 1730, and No. 29 was one of the later houses. Its first occupant, John Brindley, was the son of a Staffordshire parson, who had had the book-loving Bishop Moore as his tutor at Cambridge, and may have passed on to his son book-loving tastes acquired from the bishop. Before taking the shop in New Bond Street, John Brindley had been in business as a bookbinder 'at Christ's Hospital Gate near the Pump in Little Britain', and in 1724 had shown his quality by publishing the *Commentarius de Bello Gallico* of Bernardus Oricellarius (Bernardo Rucellai) 'concerning Charles VIII his descent into Italy'. He started in New Bond Street as a bookseller, and as early as 26 October 1728 his name occurs in a list of those from whom the sale catalogue of the library of

'the late learned Dr. Woodward' might be obtained. He published alone or with others many books of some importance, his most notable single-handed ventures being a neat series of Latin classics (begun in 1744) and an edition of the *Faerie Queene* (edited by Dr. Birch), which came in unhappy conflict with the edition by Thomas Edwards.

John Brindley died 1 March 1758, and his widow Penelope carried on the business until her own death a year later. In doing this she was helped by James Robson, a young shopman, less than three years out of his apprenticeship, and it was to Robson that her daughter sold the business. He held it for nearly fifty years and added to its reputation, and as some of his correspondence with his brothers and also a journal which he kept on a visit to Italy have been preserved, he fills half the text of this book and the whole of an appendix which is within a page or two as long as the text. He was the youngest of the four sons of Robert Robson, a Cumberland yeoman of Sebergham, near Carlisle, a district with many connexions with Queen's College, Oxford, whence the eldest son, another Robert, proceeded to holy orders; the second son (Isaac) remained at home, while the third (John) studied law. When James had the offer of Brindley's business John put all his spare cash (about £150) at his disposal and entered into a bond, with some of the friends of the family, for the completion of the payment of the purchase money. If John had kept the family letters according to the practice of Robert and James we should probably have known much more as to how James prospered in his early years as head of the business. With capital to pay off he was cautious, and while he took a share in publications published little on his own account, even the *Original Fables* of the Rev. John Kidgell, which he issued in 1763, being probably a commission book. It is in a letter from John (then land-steward to the Bishop of Durham) to Robert in 1767 that we read that James had been able to buy his house for £850, so

that by that time any early difficulties must have been surmounted and the record of the years which follow is one of increasing activities. He published many books, and by 1775 had become venturesome enough to offer John Strange, the British Resident at Venice, £100 for a volume of 'papers' which he had never seen, and without even knowing whether the '200 quarto pages' mentioned by the author meant pages in manuscript or print. In 1787 he made a long-projected visit to Italy in company with James Edwards, their business object being to see the Pinelli library at Venice, which was ultimately sold under Robson's auspices in London, though diminished by the capture of one third of it by pirates. Robson's diary of the expedition, which extended from July to the end of October, is in the British Museum and the copious extracts given from it are full of interest not exclusively bookish. He outlived his brothers and three of his four sons and died in harness in 1806, leaving a legacy to his assistant, William Fell, who reappears as the junior partner in the firm of John Nornaville and William Fell, who occupied 29 New Bond Street for the next twenty-four years, and while paying little attention to publishing greatly developed the department of old books. Of Mr. Nornaville little is known—he may have been a French *émigré* who had partly anglicized his name from De Normanville—but he lives in a couple of pages in Dibdin's account of the Roxburghe sale in 1812, where 'the quiet and grave Mr. Nornaville' secured so many rarities at top prices that a rumour started, and grew with each success, 'he is bidding for Bonaparte', his commissions having really come from the Duke of Devonshire.

In 1830 Nornaville (then seventy-six) and Fell were succeeded by Thomas and William Boone, sons of Thomas Boone, bookseller in Hanover Street and Swallow Street, and who themselves had gained experience during fifteen or sixteen years at Russell Court, Covent Garden. In 1849 they succeeded

Thomas Rodd as buyers for the British Museum, and in 1852 they offered to the Trustees the Bedford 'Missal', a Breviary presented to Isabel of Castile, three Horae made for the Infanta Juana, Francis I, and a Bishop of Auxerre, and three other books, all for the modest sum of £3,000. Sir Frederic Madden, sad to say, tried to reduce the price by £500, but the price was paid and the Department of Manuscripts greatly enriched. William Boone in 1860 retired in favour of his nephew Thomas, and the two Thomas Boones, 'who had themselves made ample fortunes', in 1872 sold their business to Frederick Startridge Ellis, son of Joseph Ellis of the 'Star and Garter' Hotel, Richmond. F. S. Ellis, after making up for a desultory education by studying in France and Germany and serving in other firms, had set up for himself in 1860 at 33 King Street, Covent Garden, where ten years later he published Rossetti's first volume of original verse. He was a cultured and also a lovable man, and all the Morris and Rossetti circle and most of the great collectors of his day regarded him as their personal friend. Old Bernard Quaritch also loved him, as some very interesting extracts from his letters amply show, though Quaritch's ambition to become the world's leading antiquarian bookseller often led him to bid far ahead of the prices of the day to demonstrate to Ellis's customers that if they wanted to get the finest books they must go to Piccadilly and not to Bond Street. From 1871 Ellis had been partnered by David White, and a year after the latter's retirement in 1884 he himself retired, leaving the business in the hands of his nephew, Gilbert Ifold Ellis, who for ten years, 1887-97, had Robert Victor Elvey, son of Sir George Elvey, organist of Windsor Castle, as his partner, and subsequently was helped by the senior of the present owners, Mr. J. J. Holdsworth. Mr. Holdsworth acquired the business soon after the death of Mr. G. I. Ellis in 1902, but retained the name 'Ellis' as a memorial to those who had made it famous. He speedily

tempted away from the Librarianship of the Linen Hall Library, Belfast, Mr. George Smith, a former fellow worker at No. 29, and so the firm continues, with Mr. Frank Benger as a recent addition. It has always been a very pleasant firm to deal with, and never more pleasant than when in 1912, as here set forth, it offered the British Museum a series of twenty-four hitherto unrecorded English news-sheets printed at various dates about 1620. This was one of the few strikingly interesting purchases which Mr. Arthur Miller had the opportunity of making during his very short keepership of Printed Books, and I have always felt grateful to Messrs. Ellis for bringing the book to him at a very moderate price. To do honour to the firm I have made this notice into an epitome of its book, but there are many good things in the book besides those I have taken, and as a contribution to the history of bookselling and book-collecting during the last two centuries it should be acquired by every library where there are readers who take interest in these matters. It is illustrated with a dozen excellent plates beginning with the trade card of John Brindley. The most interesting is a pencil drawing of New Bond Street, c. 1835, with No. 29 and Boone's name above the window, which still juts out into the street as it did in the eighteenth century.

A. W. P.

Les Joyaux de l'Enluminure à la Bibliothèque Nationale, par HENRY MARTIN, Administrateur honoraire de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, avec un Avant-Propos du Comte A. de Laborde, Membre de l'Institut, Paris et Bruxelles, Les éditions G. Van Oest, 1928. 420 francs (subscription price).

THE memorable 'Exposition du Moyen Age' at the Bibliothèque Nationale in January and February 1926 threw an interesting light on the difference in the French and English attitudes towards illuminated manuscripts. In the Bibliothèque Nationale there has been for some years no standing exhibition of manuscripts, while even students are not encouraged

to consult the more precious illuminated volumes. As a result the attendance at this exhibition, despite an entrance fee of five francs, was so great as to make it difficult to approach the show-cases. One cannot help contrasting a recent free exhibition in the Grenville Library of some of the finest extant Flemish miniatures which passed almost unnoticed both by the press and by the general public. Least of all did it occur to any publisher to perpetuate it in the form of a book, and one waited in vain for any announcement, lyrical or otherwise, of such an intention.¹

The sumptuous volume under notice is actually the second of two independent publications issued to commemorate the manuscript section of the Paris exhibition, and is yet another testimonial to the enterprise of the firm of Van Oest in all matters relating to art, while it has also an especial if a melancholy interest as the last work of the late M. Henry Martin. The text is preceded by a sympathetic notice of the author by M. le Comte A. de Laborde, and by a bibliography of M. Martin's works, so that it constitutes a fitting memorial of a distinguished French librarian and scholar.

The work itself consists of a general introduction in seven chapters, followed by short notices of the manuscripts reproduced, with bibliographical references. The seven chapters cover respectively Byzantine illumination; Carolingian illumination; the monastic period and the coming of lay illuminators (the tenth to the thirteenth century); the 'grande époque' of French illumination, from the end of the thirteenth

¹ Compare the opening sentences of the prospectus of the volume under notice: 'L'Exposition du Moyen Age, organisée en février 1926 à la Bibliothèque Nationale, a laissé une trace ineffaçable dans la mémoire de tous les amis et admirateurs des merveilles de l'enluminure. Ce fut un éclair de joie, bientôt évanoui. Aujourd'hui, tous ces splendides spécimens de la décoration ont repris discrètement leur place. L'étincellement des fonds d'or, le chatoiement des couleurs, tout cela a disparu, après quelques semaines d'éclat. L'arc-en-ciel s'est éteint. . . .'

century onwards ; illumination under Charles VI and the Duc de Berry ; the fifteenth century, with special reference to the Burgundian and Tours schools ; and the last phase and decay of the art. If for a work with a general title it deals almost too exclusively both in the text and the plates with French manuscripts M. Martin may be readily excused, French illumination having been his special subject, and the Bibliothèque Nationale containing, as is only to be expected, the finest existing collection of French work. He is particularly sound on the question of the grouping of manuscripts of the Carolingian period (pp. 14-15). Accepting as a fact that manuscripts at this date were all monastic productions, he points out that although a given volume was executed in a Touraine abbey we may not be right in accepting its illuminations as products of the art of Touraine. The artist of such a volume may again be transferred to a Reims monastery, where he will illuminate a manuscript in a style identical with that of the volume executed by him in the Loire neighbourhood. The portability of manuscripts, which may be copied again in their new home, and the likelihood of artists travelling are not always sufficiently remembered. M. Martin's account of the illuminators employed at the Burgundian Court in the fifteenth century is good reading, particularly where he deals with that unattractive but painstaking miniaturist Loyset Liedet, whose fidelity in reproducing details of his own period is only equalled by his lack of historical sense. In M. Martin's words (p. 73), 'Il nous montrera Jules César vêtu comme son puissant protecteur le duc de Bourgogne ; et si le conquérant fait à Rome une entrée triomphale, c'est le pape en personne qui l'accueillera. Audessus du trône de Néron apparaît le Christ en croix entre la Vierge et Saint Jean. Le siège de Jérusalem se fera à coups de canon. . . .'

The volume is illustrated with two plates in colour and one hundred in collotype, of the quality that one associates with

M. Van Oest's publications, except that Plate 86 (evidently photographed from a reproduction instead of from the manuscript) is very much below standard. Care has been taken in their selection to avoid duplication, as far as possible, of the plates in M. Couderc's *Les Enluminures des Manuscrits du Moyen Age* (1927), the first of the two publications noted above. It must, however, be added that several of the plates in the present volume have already appeared in previous works issued by the same firm, a practice that one may perhaps deprecate except in cases where the manuscript in question has only one outstanding page. In one instance (Pl. 44, a reprint of Pl. XVI of M. d'Ancona's *La Miniature italienne*, 1925), the two pages on the plate, but not the folio references, have been transposed. It is of course possible that these were wrong in M. d'Ancona's plate and have now been corrected, a point which can only be settled by reference to the manuscript.

E. G. M.

An Elizabethan Journal, being a record of those things most talked of during the years 1591-4. By G. B. HARRISON. London, Constable & Co., Ltd. 1928, pp. xxiv. 430. 31s. 6d.

HAVING conceived the brilliant idea of gleaning from contemporary records and books what London was talking about in four very important years of Shakespeare's life, Mr. Harrison has boldly given his *Journal* a popular form, using his sources freely, 'at one time borrowing phrases, sentences, and even whole pages, at another condensing and paraphrasing' as suited his purpose, and stringing his quotations together in the vocabulary of the day. He can quote the similar course taken by M. Anatole France in his life of Joan of Arc as a precedent, but the links are supplied so naturally and unpretentiously that they need no justification. For the learned there are references to the sources used for each entry at the end of the book, and if the learned are aggrieved that they

cannot quote entries without taking the trouble to look up the originals they need not be pitied. The real grievance against Mr. Harrison is that it is too difficult to stop reading his book when once it has been taken up, and it made havoc of my work and kept me out of bed until it was finished. It lacks, of course, the interest of a single personality lying behind it as in a real diary, and it is perhaps unavoidably defective in containing few of the references to sermons and church-going which we find in Pepys. We may be sure that there was as much church-going when Shakespeare was in London as in Pepys's day, but it may be that there are few sermons giving their dates of delivery extant from these years, and Henry Smith, the most popular preacher of the day, had retired to die in the country just before the Journal begins. Otherwise most topics which would have been the subject of talk in these years find a place in Mr. Harrison's record, and the variety of them makes a fine medley full of interest and importance for the literary students of the period. In an appendix Mr. Harrison collects some of the points which may have passed into Shakespeare's plays, for instance the poor quality of the common soldiers (especially the Gloster ones) shipped off against their wills to the war in France. I hope we may have a further instalment of the Journal with no undue delay.

A. W. P.

The Collected Letters of Oliver Goldsmith. Edited by KATHARINE C. BALDERSTON, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of English Literature at Wellesley College. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1928. pp. li, 190.

Two years ago Dr. Katharine Balderston produced an admirable *Census of the Manuscripts of Oliver Goldsmith* (published by E. B. Hackett, the Brick Row Book Shop, New York), in which she listed, with their pedigrees, as far as these could be ascertained, Goldsmith's extant letters, his business receipts

and agreements, the not very important literary manuscripts of his which have survived, and the three books bearing his presentation inscription, besides certain items of undetermined authority and several forgeries. As a result of this spadework she has produced the text, carefully annotated, of the fifty-three letters accepted as genuine, with (in appendixes) two doubtful and eight forged letters, also Mrs. Hodson's narrative of her brother's early life. A sympathetic but clear-sighted introduction discusses Goldsmith's relations with his family, the authenticity of the 'adventure upon Fiddleback', Goldsmith's plan to obtain a post in India, his poem for the *Threnodia Augustalis* performed in memory of the Princess Dowager, 20 February 1772, and the production of *She Stoops to Conquer*. On all these points Miss Balderston sheds new light and Goldsmith at his best could deserve no better editor, while the Cambridge University Press has invested its printing of the book with so much charm that we feel apologetic in pointing out that on page 108, line 6, there appears to be a misprint of 'it' for 'if'. Perhaps some members of the Bibliographical Society may find a little flaw of another kind in the absence of any tribute to the services of our late Vice-President, Sir Ernest Clarke, who unearthed, after it had been disregarded for many years, the 'large bundle of papers collected by Bishop Percy of Dromore', which contained not only Chatterton matter, 'but chiefly and most interestingly a large quantity of original letters written by and about Oliver Goldsmith'. Sir Ernest's paper on *The Family Letters of Oliver Goldsmith*, read before the Society on 15 October 1917, charmed those who heard it, and though the illness which ended in his death prevented him from carrying his researches to the perfection which Miss Balderston has attained, something more than a reference in two foot-notes seems due to his pioneer work.

A. W. P.

Bibliography enumerative and historical. By HENRY BARTLETT VAN HOESEN, with the collaboration of FRANK KELLER WALTER. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York and London. 1928, pp. xiii. 516. Price 27s. 6d.

THIS is a very good book of its kind, certainly the best that has been produced, and the kind is perhaps to be judged as good or bad, not in itself, but according to the use made of it. The title of the book is accurate, the term 'practical', which used to be applied playfully to the bibliography of modern books as opposed to old ones, being appropriately given to a chapter which offers excellent advice to any one wishing to make a bibliography and see it through the press. The hundred and sixty pages devoted to enumerative bibliography are largely unreadable, but any practised reader who glances through them will gain a good idea of how to set about discovering what has been written on a large variety of subjects. The hundred and forty-seven pages on historical bibliography comprise chapters on the history of writing (profusely, if rather scrappily, illustrated), the history of printing, book-decoration, and the book-trade, all of them rather breathlessly written, and with some mistakes (e.g. Schoeffer is said to have 'succeeded to the business' started by Fust as early as 1462, and Fust to have been 'among the victims' of the sack of Mainz in that year, whereas he was working as late as 1466), but on the whole they may be accepted as very competent summaries. Finally a bibliographical appendix of seventy-eight pages enumerates under 1643 numbers not far short of two thousand books to which the chapters on enumerative bibliography form a kind of introduction. Whether it is advantageous to students to have all this miscellaneous information packed for them between one pair of covers may perhaps be questioned; as a text-book prescribed for examinations it would produce bibliographical dyspepsia of the worst kind. But if dyspepsia can be avoided it should certainly help a good man to find his way about his subjects pretty quickly.

Proceedings of the Fiftieth Anniversary Conference of the Library Association held at Edinburgh 26-30 September 1927. Grafton & Co., 1928. pp. xxix, 216. Price (revised) 10s. 6d.

THIS report of the proceedings at the Jubilee conference of the Library Association last year at Edinburgh is a pleasantly printed volume ranging in size with *The Library Association Record* and adorned with a woodcut of the Castle Rock as a frontispiece. It contains one sadly delightful paper, 'Early Days', a retrospect by the Hon. Secretary, in which Frank Pacy, whose loss to the Association can hardly be exaggerated, despite his ill health gave a most vivacious account of the original conference of 1877 and the doings of the Association during the next twenty years. In other papers Dr. Dickson describes the negotiations which led up to the transformation of the Advocates' Library into the National Library of Scotland, and Colonel Newcombe outlines his hopes for the future of the Central Library for Students. There are also reports of important discussions on the Report of the Public Libraries Committee initiated by a very clear statement by its chairman, Sir Frederic Kenyon, and on the establishment of an International Library and Bibliographical Committee. Altogether there is plenty of information in the volume to which students may want to refer in future years, but their tempers will be sorely tried when they begin to hunt for what they want, as the volume has no index and the running head-lines are, on the left, 'Library Association Edinburgh Conference', and on the right, the day of the week!

The Year's Work in English Studies. Volume VII. 1926. Edited for the English Association by F. S. BOAS and C. H. HERFORD. Oxford University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1928. pp. 321. Price 7s. 6d.

THIS seventh volume of *The Year's Work in English Studies* was published in February of the present year, and should have been noticed in an earlier number, as belatedness in a review

suggests belatedness in the record, and we would not have our own sins, however involuntary, debited to this excellent survey of current criticism and research. The present volume notices 661 publications (316 books and 345 articles) as against 626 for the previous year (309 books and 317 articles). To obtain from competent critics so large a number of estimates on such a variety of themes, and to pass the volume in which they are collected through the press within fourteen months of the close of the year of which the work is surveyed, shows that no time has been wasted. As usual there are some changes in the staff, Miss Hilda Murray taking the place of Professor Tolkien in writing on 'Philology: General Works', and Miss Marjorie Daunt that of Professor Gordon on 'Old English Studies'. One of the satisfactory features of *The Year's Work* is that it has by this time created its own atmosphere and tone, and that whoever writes can be relied on to make an honest attempt both to do justice to the books noticed and show how far they can be trusted and where they add to existing knowledge.

EDITOR'S NOTE

THE present issue of *The Library* has all the appearance of a special Dramatic Number. That for September was very largely concerned with the Protestant controversial Literature of the Sixteenth Century. There is some advantage in papers on cognate subjects appearing together in the same number, as one may usefully illustrate, or carry on the work reported in, another. The September number was fruitful in corrections and additions to the *Short Title Catalogue*, and in dramatic bibliography, especially as it illustrates that of Shakespeare, the Editor has also a personal interest. It is possible that knowledge of this personal interest may have caused some of the papers to be offered to *The Library*, and the Editor certainly has had great pleasure in printing them. But he earnestly desires that the contents of *The Library* may be representative of all the bibliographical work that is being done, and he wishes therefore to state that he will gladly give favourable consideration to papers embodying the results of original research on any subject of bibliographical interest irrespective of country or period.

A. W. P.